

# THE STUDENT WORLD

A quarterly magazine published at 13 Rue Calvin, Geneva  
by the World's Student Christian Federation

PHILIPPE MAURY, *Editor*

---

VOLUME XLVII

First Quarter, 1954

NUMBER I

---

## Pastoral Care

*A Test for the S.C.M.*

The question about pastoral care is a test for the Student Christian Movement. It asks us whether we see human need, whether we trust the Master of human need, whether our witness to Him is concrete, whether we take seriously that these things happen in the Church. "Pastoral care" is a question about the S.C.M.'s besetting sin — abstractness — put by the One who became flesh for our sakes.

As a Federation, we have not spoken a great deal until recently about pastoral care. Our primary attention has been given to witness and ecumenism. The Federation program of recent years has had Bible study as its basis, and politics, university, and ecumenism as its principal "concerns". At the same time, evangelism — witness — has become increasingly the dominant motive of this program, and thereby has come a question: is our S.C.M. program, in general, too abstract for witness? Do we know that the Gospel is spoken — not simply to the *problems* of citizens, students, churchmen — but to individual *persons*?

To think about that, our S.C.M.s sent about thirty of us to Finland last summer, to live together for three weeks in the Federation's Study Chalet on "Pastoral Care". The addresses, some findings, some comments on this Chalet and on aspects of its theme make up this issue of *The Student World*. They are

not definitive, because the question surprised us in its depth, and clearly requires much future pondering in the S.C.M.s. Perhaps because of this, the editor has asked one participant to make a personal evaluation of the significance of the Chalet for the S.C.M.s, to present not the consensus of the Chalet, necessarily, but what he, as one person, learned from the experience. If there is little new here — in view of the long wisdom of the Church in this matter — it is still important to face "pastoral care" from the special perspective of the S.C.M.

The work of the Chalet seemed to me to embrace four principal themes: the Gospel itself, human needs, the nurture of Christians, and Christian witness.

1) *What is the Good News?* . . . that in pastoral care we deal not with good counsel, but with the good Lord, who is on the side of the one in need, fighting his battle for him. It is *news* because it tells not just of good advice, but of a change in the situation itself. It is *good* news because it tells not just of new resources, but that the Master of the situation has now arrived on our side.

This means, especially for the S.C.M., that we cannot escape the question of authority in pastoral care . . . much more, that pastoral care begins with authority, rightly understood. Pastoral care knows of a living Master; if Christ is not risen, then there is no pastoral care. Then, of course, it would be better to forget about authority; for human authority generally complicates things, except in rare cases where, if it is highly skilled, it may sometimes help with some of the elements of human need. But Christ is risen. That means that pastoral care is concerned with authority. That means that pastoral care becomes serious.

How? *First*: human need gets redefined: we have to ask whether the need we see is the need that He sees. *Second*: all — not just the skilled — have a pastoral task: the priesthood of all believers becomes a serious question, not just of good church order, but of how, in Christ's name, we take care of each other. *Third*: our pastoral care must take seriously the ways He has appointed to meet us — in His Word, in the scriptures, in the fellowship of the Church, in the sacraments — without excluding the possibility that He can meet us



anywhere. *Fourth* : confession and absolution become a possibility — and this shows how serious pastoral care becomes : if Christ lives, we deal not just with a doctrine of forgiveness, but with the possibility that He may ask one to declare God's forgiveness of another's sins. It was for this that the Jews put Jesus to death. If He is not risen, then the Jews were right... and we have no right to blaspheme the righteous judgment of God by trying to help another with his burden of sin.

For the S.C.M., the meaning of this is clear : we begin with pastoral care not simply from the desire to help each other ; we begin with the One who has really brought help. Some have asked whether "pastoral care" is the right title for what the Federation is here trying to face. In spite of its clerical overtones, I believe that it is, because it points first of all to the true Pastor — the Shepherd — and with Him pastoral care begins and ends.

2) *Human need*. No commentary is needed on the fact of human need in the university — yes, of suffering and tragedy. Just the clamant presence of human need raises the real problem : how is need understood in pastoral care ?

There were two previous Federation attempts to face this question. At Whitby in 1949, we studied "the student milieu" — concentrating on the day-to-day environment in which the student lives. At Nasrapur in 1953, we studied the problems of the individual student as he sees them. In neither case did we seem to get far with pastoral care.

What is need ? There was some inclination at the Chalet to draw on previous work, and understand human need as broken relationships. We found many problems clustering around the individual's relation to the principal social institutions — such as the home and marriage, the state, the economic order, the school and university, the Church. Other problems, e. g., loneliness and insecurity, have obvious connections with this scheme of analysis. And here it was evident that we need to learn much from social psychology.

Considerable attention was also given to counselling, i. e., the skilled capacity to help a person who brings a problem on his own initiative. We were soon beyond our depth in psychotherapy and medicine, and readily agreed that on these ques-

tions, the Federation needs much expert help, and that S.C.M. dilettantism can only do harm.

Further, there is a temptation to think that most needs are problems requiring therapy, social work, or even legislative correction. By far the larger part of pastoral care has to do with simply helping each other keep running what André Dumas called the Christian race... stirring up, encouraging, warning, loving. Pastoral care involves both the *cure* and the *care* of souls.

To such patient, necessary analysis of human need, the Chalet gave much time. But all the while, a deeply unsettling question grew among us: does Christ understand human need as we do? At what point in the scale of human need does sin appear? Do we have any understanding of human need until we see it "in Christ"?

This does not mean that pastoral care is concerned with "sin", but not with family problems. Above all, it does not mean that pastoral care is concerned only with the "sin" in family problems. Christ does not simply preach to hungry men: He feeds them, five thousand of them. He does not just forgive the paralytic: He heals him. Even so, pastoral care is not interested in man's whole need because Christ was, but because He *is*. The question is not fundamentally how *we* understand human need. We know that Christ does — that He takes it seriously — that He is the only one who does take it seriously, both as we feel it and as it really is.

This means that the basis for understanding need in pastoral care is faith in the One who knows what the need really is, and overcomes it. Negatively this means that we may use, but not ultimately trust, our analysis of need — not our analysis of the crisis in the university, nor our analysis of the political dilemma, nor even our psychological knowledge. More piercing than all analysis of human need is the concrete situation in which God shows a man what he really needs.

Is it not just in this revelation that our analysis of need becomes real? Without the revelation in Jesus Christ, can we ever see that broken human relationships (with all their interior consequences) reflect the brokenness of our relation to God? Until God shows us the price He pays to re-establish His rela-



tion with us, can we ever understand how broken that relation really is? Until we see how He restores that relation, can we ever understand what a real relationship is? In the light of grace we see what sin is: that is the truth of human need. In the light of grace we also see that sin has been overcome: that is the possibility of pastoral care. And the light by which we see this is the Light of the World.

3) *The Nurture of Christians.* This *Student World* may lack an adequate reflection of the work we did on such themes as prayer, use of the Bible, confession and absolution, Christian fellowship. From many points, one is chosen here: pastoral care and the Church.

Francis House helped us see that pastoral care does not simply ask how an individual may get right with his God and fellow man. Pastoral care is Christ's work (in which we are asked to share) in calling the individual to be a living stone in God's building — the Church. It is the work of the Head, in and through His Body. And the means of this work are the elements which constitute the Church: the Word and sacraments, preaching and fellowship.

But is the S.C.M. the Church? This now becomes a burning question if we speak of a pastoral task of the S.C.M. Hitherto, we have said that the sacraments belong to the Church, not to the S.C.M.; in this sense the S.C.M. is not the Church. We have also asked this question from the missionary angle and spoken of the S.C.M. as a missionary fellowship characterized by a "conversation" between Christian members and non-Christian members on an equal footing; while this S.C.M. may be an "arm of the Church", it is not yet the Church.

Here, quite un-theoretically, is a new putting of the question, and one that may require some revision of our answer. Is pastoral care possible in an S.C.M. which does not take seriously its place in the Body of Christ? Differently put: does the S.C.M. take the Church seriously when it considers it a place to go for the sacraments but not for fellowship, or as a "spiritual home", but not as a missionary instrument?

The problem became more acute when we were forced to face the fact — reported from many countries — that S.C.M. members generally regard the S.C.M., not the Church, as their

primary source of Christian fellowship, i. e., as a "spiritual home", although the opinion was also virtually universal that the student's primary Christian fellowship should be the Church.

Some countries — especially where there are national churches and virtually everyone is baptized — frankly consider the S.C.M. to be the Church, and allow it the use of the sacraments. It was a fact at the Chalet that delegates from these countries tended to consider questions from the perspective of pastoral care, whereas the missionary perspective was more characteristic of others. If this solution depends on the existence of a baptized population, then it is ruled out for most of the Federation.

Must we not say that this question of the S.C.M. and the Church remains decidedly open, and that the Whitby and Nasrapur statements on the Church and the S.C.M. do not reflect adequately the presuppositions of the S.C.M.'s pastoral task, which are the presuppositions on which the Church is built?

4) *Christian Witness*. Is there such a thing as pastoral care of non-Christians? Is pastoral care something which can be exercised only within the Church? Is there, e. g. some *essential* difference between declaring absolution to a Christian and telling an unbeliever that in Christ his sins are forgiven?

Too sharp a division here makes witness abstract, and pastoral care irrelevant in the modern world. Can witness be genuine without human concern and care? And what kind of Church is it which cares only for its own members? This prospect has led some to speak of "the pastoral dimension of witness", the pastoral dimension of the Federation "concerns". What, e. g., are the human, personal problems being faced in politics?

But this does not mean that pastoral care and witness are identical. Rather, "the pastoral dimension of witness" puts a question to our witness: are we witnessing to men and women in their concrete situations? We have some understanding of the crisis of the university, and of the Christian possibility of seeing the university as it might be. We also know something about the profound philosophical and theological problems raised by the fact that the Church exists within the university.



Christian witness in the university requires thought about these problems. But we may not forget that the "pastoral dimension" of these problems is their human dimension, their concrete form, where students and professors are hurt by them, and need the cure and care of the Pastor Himself. The "pastoral dimension" of witness is not an addition to witness: it is the dimension in which witness takes place, where the adequacy or inadequacy of our language — can the Federation "concerns" be better understood than as a study of the language of witness? — must be put into the service of human need, and therefore of the Master of human need.

JOHN DESCHNER.

## The Biblical Foundation of Mutual Spiritual Help

ANDRÉ DUMAS

We are not going to speak of the cure of souls ("pastoral care") in the limited sense of the pastoral ministry. However, we shall not use it either in the vague sense of human brotherhood. But we shall pass beyond a definition which would be too circumscribed through being limited to a particular function, and beyond a hope which, human nature being what it is, would be too utopian, and shall see what the Bible has to say about whether it is permissible and possible, necessary and beneficial, to lay claim as a Christian to become the "pastor", the guide, the bearer of another man entrusted to us by God. We are going to reflect deeply on this mutual spiritual help, which we all know is central to the communion of saints and is confessed in the Creed, but which we also know may be the most presumptuous, the most dangerous of enterprises, as well as the most precious.

Let us first remove the dust and impurities from the words we are using. It is, of course, agreed that in speaking of the cure of souls (*cure d'âmes*) we are rather speaking, in biblical vocabulary, of the care of the man, the whole being, spirit, heart and body. For us the soul is the core of the man, the place where, intermingled, life, will, intelligence, blood, flesh and breath make their decisions, are together imprisoned by Satan and delivered by God. When we speak of the "pastor", the shepherd, we are taking up the old image of the prophets and the apostles, where the shepherd, who is God Himself, knows each one of His sheep, each one of His children, and causes them to hear His voice, guiding them, reassuring them, and bringing them out of their darkness by the simple hearing of His Word. So we are not thinking of that current distortion of the image, which in too many Christian utterances changes



the pastor, the clergyman or the good layman into a shepherd who has become a watch-dog, ready to bark to make the faint-hearted move on, while the ideal parishioner becomes the good sheep, regular as clock-work, blind and docile.

When we use the old latin word *cure*, we know that even etymologically it includes the meaning of burden and overwhelming anxiety. In French, it evokes as well the idea of cleansing and scraping, which, if applied to men rather than things, could make it all too easy to urge in the direction of forcing, planing down, in short, doing violence to human beings. The classical dictionary of our country, *Litttré*, gives the information that in old French *curer* thus had variously the meanings "to clean", "to bear on one's heart", or "to have care of". May our mutual spiritual help, our pastoral practice, our *cure d'âmes* be essentially this basic, respectful care of the whole man, avoiding at all times distress and anxiety, or a cleansing which at one moment is superficial and in the next does violence, the threat of which descends on us so quickly as soon as we take upon ourselves the work of being shepherds — not of passive sheep, but of living men !

*Helpmeets, keepers and pastors of our brothers  
in the Old Testament.*

The whole Old Covenant helps us to see what possibilities man retains of being in a genuine way the support of his brother : in the beginning man was created two : man and woman (Gen. 1 : 27). Thus there was placed in human beings something which might be an analogy of what is in God Himself, which could be His image (v. 26) and call forth this mutual knowledge, love and decision which makes God a Trinity ; not a lonely Lord, but a Father, a Son and a Holy Spirit. We should notice that solitude is rejected for the man who has been created *before* he is given the power of mastery over the world and of fertility in life. For the solitude of the strong man is the worst temptation of all. The weak man is protected from it in a painful but effective fashion by his state of dependence. The strong man would come to a terrible end, swallowed up in the sufficiency of his power, if from the beginning it had not

been laid down that precisely man, who is destined to keep and to cultivate the world, to be if you will its priest and pastor, must never exercise this mastery, this "pastoral care" in solitude. At least, that was the plan willed by God...

In Genesis 2 : 18-23, we find a rather better explanation of the reason for this original duality : there man is seen responding to everything in the world : giving names to the beasts of the field, the cattle, and the birds of the air, but himself receiving no response. Here man appears as a shepherd who tends each animal of his flock, but for himself knows only unsatisfied desire. He is in charge of others, but no one cares about what *his* burden may be ! Then, out of the drowsiness brought about by unsatisfied fatigue and toil without plenitude, God offers him woman, the un-hoped for response, impossible of invention, living grace. She is not entrusted to the man as someone else to whom a name must be given and who must be borne along, to whom he would have to give his response without receiving the same from her in turn. She is a "helpmeet"<sup>1</sup>. And the man is ready to leave all which, in this patriarchal period, seemed most basic for life, "father and mother" (Gen. 2 : 24) in order to attach himself to the only one who can bring him out of his solitude as a "pastor" and master of the creation. Here, between the man and "her who will be called woman"<sup>2</sup> there reigns a perfect order in human relationships : no one is shepherd, no one is sheep, and nevertheless no one is alone, either in his dependence or, above all, in his strength. Each one lives in glorious liberty, but at the same time each attaches himself to the other in spontaneous sacrifice and devotion.

<sup>1</sup> We should bear in mind that the Hebrew word used in Genesis 2 : 20 places the emphasis on "meet" and not on "help". The woman is, although so different, none the less the fellow, the companion of the man. In this she is a help to him, and that not by being his aid in the sense of a being who is good simply for filling out the details that man alone could not have dealt with. ("Helpmeet" is rendered in French *aide-semblable*. The author's note is more intelligible if we bear in mind the affinity of "meet" and "mate" in English — *Translator*).

<sup>2</sup> This is the expression used in Genesis 2 : 23. Adam and Eve, which are *different* names, only appear in the world of the Fall. (Gen. 3 : 20). In the Garden of Eden it is enough for the man to have "another self", to whom he gives no name, for she does not depend on him in the way the animals do. "She will be called woman" (*ischa*, feminine man). The wonder of the inventions of God !



It is remarkable that this original relation between man and woman is the only pointer the Bible gives us to the perfection of all human relationships. The prophetic and apocalyptic passages bearing on the general returning to perfection of all things make a stirring echo of it: they, too, emphasize the proximity of the animals to man as he responds to them, as they do also the absence henceforth of "pastoral care", of teaching, of one taking responsibility for the other. "No one shall teach his neighbour — for all will know me, from the smallest to the greatest" (Jer. 31 : 34). "They will need neither lamp nor light, for the Lord God will illumine them" (Rev. 22 : 5).

But that world of the "helpmeet" exists no longer. Genesis 3 introduces us to the present world, where man is no longer he who makes an open response, who is a helpmeet, who attaches himself to someone else, but he who hides away, who fights and flees. As Hegel wrote, henceforth "every conscience seeks the death of the other". We cannot be too actively concerned about the gravity of this situation before we lay claim to being able to give spiritual help to our brother... André Malraux puts these words into the mouth of one of his heroes: "Men are not my fellows; they are the people who look at me and sit in judgment on me. My fellows are those who love me and do not look at me." This is what Adam and his helpmeet became. First of all we realize how far they are apart from one another, when the serpent suddenly appears. "Adam, and Eve as well, where art thou?" "And thou, eternal God, where art thou?" When they reappear to one another, close and attached, the help they once gave each other turns irrevocably into the accusation they hurl at one another. The word is no longer the servant of mutual understanding, but is used for concealment and for face-to-face opposition. Their nakedness before each other is a cause no longer for wonder, but for fear. Their eyes no longer meet like outstretched hands, but as judgments, which pierce. Their love lives on only in their aggressiveness.

### *Results of the Fall*

This Fall brings in its train consequences for human relationships which in a certain sense man and woman wanted, or at least preferred (Gen. 3 : 1-13), but it also brings consequences

which now must be borne with suffering, such as hostility between humanity and creation, between animal, life and earth, or again the growing divergence between the work, the interest and the sufferings of each individual (Gen. 3 : 14-19). The woman, for example, will bring forth her children in sorrow, the man will suffer in his toil, but these sufferings will be so different, so incommunicable, that instead of bringing them together, they will increase all the more the opposition between them. Henceforth man will endure the vengeance which his fellow, battered by the world, will invent to inflict on him. The attachment of man to man will no longer be a joyous abandonment, but a burden, unbearable and immemorial. And all this to the moment of death, which itself will mean return to the earth, scattering and oblivion, while the creation of man from this same earth was a process of fashioning, of giving of life, of growth (Contrast Gen. 3 : 19 and Gen. 2 : 7 !). If man wanted to become again one day a helpmeet, this separation of each from the other would have to be overcome, for it is that which brings about this lack of understanding and this suffering, with their ever divisive character. But how could one make another approach to someone whose very nearness is now a source of accusation, of fear and desire for vengeance ?

With Genesis 4 : 1-16 the second stage in the possibilities of human relations begins. Since there is no longer a helpmeet, could man be at his least his brother's keeper ? God believes so, for He has endowed Cain and Abel with different callings, and even with different favours<sup>1</sup>, and thus with opportunities for bitterness and hate ; but He nevertheless considers it possible for Cain to overcome his anger, to raise his face and master the evil desire which lies in wait for him. Elijah, Jeremiah and Jonah were also angry, and overcame their anger. Cain tries to re-establish contact with Abel by resorting to the spoken

<sup>1</sup> Why did God look favourably on Abel and his offering but not on Cain ? (Gen. 4 : 4). Hebrews 2 : 4 and John 3 : 12 give us two explanations by way of reassurance, one in the order of faith, the other in that of morals. But Genesis, which gives us no explanation, seems more profound. The fact is that the trials sent by God (and those by life, if we can receive them from God) are not susceptible of explanation. Perhaps tomorrow the eye of the Eternal would have fallen on Cain and not on Abel ? But the decisive thing today is that Cain should stand up to his trial.



word, *but* (the Bible tells us in verse 8) his wrath drowned his words. He threw himself upon Abel and killed him. In this second Fall man, who *can* no longer naturally be a helpmeet, does not even *desire* to be his brother's keeper. He could have kept his brother as a companion in misfortune and hope, if not as the fulfilment of his own being, in this earthly purgatory (the only real one) which is the time of patience between our fall and our salvation. But man prefers to make his brother pay the price of his own unhappiness. At most he will be the keeper who guards him under lock and key, and keeps him under surveillance, envying and punishing him. Such is man become, "a wanderer on the face of the earth", accused by the earth itself of the spilt blood of Abel, utterly alone, but nevertheless kept from death by God, who plans for him not vengeance, but a far-off salvation. Of this man who is neither helpmeet nor keeper God will slowly make the "pastor" of his brother.

As a matter of fact the first stages along the road of redemption do not bear in any significant fashion very many indications of the mutual spiritual help ordained by God. Noah saves his family by finding grace in the eyes of God, but it does not seem as though he has a direct concern for the souls of others, especially in the case of his children... In this sense Noah is the first patriarch, commissioned for the perpetuation of the chosen race until the fulfilment of the promise of God, but in no sense called to bear as a spiritual burden the lives of other men. The patriarchs are leaders and masters, intercessors and warriors, but not, in the precise sense in which we use the word today, pastors of their brothers. They must above all cleave to God, and this passionate desire for the divine blessing is the core of their existence. In the same way one does not see them commissioned either to convert, to sustain or to awaken other men for God. Admittedly Abraham, in addition to that, took thought for Lot; Jacob reconciled Esau with himself. But for them this "pastoral care" is clearly a less constantly essential objective than the struggle for divine election. Even as he intercedes on behalf of Sodom and Gomorrah, one feels that in a way the father of the faith is more concerned about keeping God from injustice while avoid-

ing His anger, than about the personal fate of the pagan inhabitants of the two cities.

*"The most perfect definition of pastoral care"*

We go as far as Moses, as the existence of the people of God, and not merely of the fathers of the faith, before we come upon the origin of mutual spiritual help of the type we attempt to practise in the Christian community. Abraham received the hope of generations yet unborn : Moses received the charge of them. From the very beginning he has to learn how difficult it is to carry out this charge of others which God has imposed on him against his will. For sinful man dislikes this stranger, commissioned by God to interfere in his affairs. Sinful man even prefers to be beaten by the Egyptian than to be dangerously delivered by a liberator ! "Who made thee a prince and a judge over us ?" (Ex. 2 : 14). Sinful man would rather continue as a slave to build the pyramids of his oppressors than journey towards his own country, towards the goodly land of Canaan, since this journey as a free man can only begin by crossing the desert. Thus there appears in Exodus 18 : 13-27 the first large-scale biblical direction on mutual spiritual help. A pagan, Jethro, priest of Midian, the father-in-law of Moses, affirms that the pastoral commission is too burdensome for a single man : "Thou wilt surely wear away both thou, and this people that is with thee : for this thing is too heavy for thee ; thou art not able to perform it thyself alone" (v. 18). From that point onwards leaders of groups of a thousand, a hundred, of fifty and of ten, will assist Moses in consulting the Eternal, in dealing individually with "hard causes", but also with "small matters" (v. 26) so "that all this people shall go to their place in peace" (v. 23). There you have the most perfect definition of "pastoral care" as the Bible teaches it. For the only way for mutual spiritual help to be given is through a team of people ; otherwise it becomes too heavy a load, or else a superficial ruling. It is no longer a blessing, but a curse on the shoulders of the man who bears it and is crushed under it. It puts him in a dangerous position of isolation over against the people, and no one emerges satisfied from this abnormal situation. Then, this mutual help concerns the "whole man" ; it is not



possible to concentrate one's attention on "hard causes" which are crucial for man, when a thousand "small matters" are also tormenting and assailing him. Finally, and chiefly, this charge has a very precise meaning: it is to lead each individual and the whole group towards the happy fulfilment of their destiny, to see to it that they have not come up out of their Egypt for no purpose, simply to groan in pain and go astray in the desert. Mutual spiritual help assists each person to go on his way through life without glancing back or believing himself to have reached the end of his journey already. If it remains authentic, it does not become an end in itself, the spiritual enjoyment of having someone to look after one, or having someone to look after. It consists in giving advice, strengthening for the journey. And thus its goal is to bear up the members of people of God, of the Church, just as the Church bears up the world as it leads it forward. "If ye will keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine; And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation" (Ex. 19: 5-6). A Church which was no longer journeying between Egypt and Canaan, between the promised salvation and the Kingdom already experienced, between baptism and the vision of God, would be a Church in which mutual spiritual help would doubtless preserve a psychological and moral value, but in which the great spiritual framework which gives it its worth would have been lost: the responsibility for seeing that the whole body of those journeying in the faith moves forward, and reaches the destination written in its origins: to remain the people which has been liberated and abundantly blessed by its Lord.

This "pastoral care" practised by Moses and his companions amongst the whole people was to split up into a number of different ministries as soon as they had settled in Canaan. Priest, king and prophet each had to perform a part in this total ministry. But it seems that with time, and perhaps too with specialization, and at all events with human unfaithfulness, this perfect mutual spiritual help practised in the desert gradually declined. From Solomon onwards the king came to think more of using the people to minister to his power than of being their servant. The priesthood became the privilege of

exploiting the sacrifices, which the prophets later so violently denounced. False prophets were to lend their wits to passing on to the people a message from the Eternal which would please men rather than God. And all the true prophets sighed aloud for the coming of God Himself as the shepherd of men (Ps. 23 ; Ps. 28 : 9 ; Is. 40 : 11 ; Jer. 23 : 1-4 ; Ez. 34 : 1-19 ; Mic. 7 : 14).

Man could not remain a "helpmeet" ; he did not wish to consider himself his "brother's keeper" ; and, further, he could not become genuinely the "shepherd" of the people of the Eternal. Mutual spiritual help, which was no longer the natural mutual help of before the Fall, was more than man could manage. It became a new and lonely opportunity for him to "domineer over those in his charge" (II Peter 5 : 3). And so after the magnificent period in the desert, the Old Testament sighs after the one who will finally be able to gather his lambs himself, carry them on his shoulders and heal them.

*Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God sacrificed for the world, and the supreme pastor of the Church, in the Gospels*

John 10 : 1-18, in the parable of the Good Shepherd, tells us exactly what Jesus was able to do and to be for men, and why He alone is worthy to bear the name Pastor. First, verses 1-5 emphasize Jesus' profound knowledge of men. In becoming flesh, He does not come to strangers, but to "his own" (John 1 : 11). He enters by the door of the sheep-fold, for He has His home in the bosom of humanity. And so it is that He can call each one by name, and be followed. For somehow the sheep do not see their shepherd, no more than many men were able to divine in Jesus of Nazareth the only Son of God. But the sheep hear the voice of their master, they recognize it and are not afraid to follow behind him. In the same way men knew themselves recognized by Jesus, unmasked by His call (the rich young ruler) or shielded by His pardoning glance (the woman taken in adultery). Thus Jesus knew how to see and how not to see, how to humble and how to raise up, in exact correspondence to the secret needs of each human heart. Notice that in this Jesus was not so much like a Socrates teaching



self-knowledge as like Moses, who recognized his own only in order to decide them to go up out of Egypt and to journey onwards through the desert. Jesus calls His sheep *in order to bring them out*. If Jesus compares us with sheep, it is moreover not, as we have seen already, in order chiefly to demonstrate amongst men the virtue of docility, but in order to hearten us. For, like sheep, men are helpless before the dangers which threaten and frighten them, especially before the wolf of death, before whom every human pastor is shown up as a mercenary, a useless fellow divorced from the situation.

So the title of shepherd is to be ascribed essentially to Jesus, because He does not flee before the dangers which distract His sheep (vv. 7-18). He can not only recognize the man, cause him to hear His voice and hearten him, but also when the time comes, defend and save him, even at the cost of His life. Here indeed is the essence of mutual spiritual help in the Bible: the Son of God could not become our supreme Shepherd without first undergoing the death of the sacrificed Lamb. It is not possible to bring relief to one's brother without undergoing his anguish. It was not that Jesus needed to suffer men's misery before He could talk to them with full comprehension. But, in the much more fundamental sense of the necessities of warfare, He could not defend His sheep by fleeing from the wolf, nor get the better of the wolf without relinquishing to him His own life. Only in this way could He lose none of those entrusted to Him by His Father.

This is a striking contrast with the official pastors of the Old Testament. Jesus accomplishes perfectly the work of the shepherd, but He forbids men its practice. "But you are not to be called rabbi, for you have one teacher, and you are all brethren" (Matt. 23 : 8). The only people who will be able to become His disciples are those who, following on the reversal of the established order which He brings about, will be the shepherds of others to the same degree as they accept to be lambs, that is, servants. The suffering of Christ alone brings redemption. It alone triumphs over the devil, who carries off the sheep. But from this time forward men will not be able to practise "pastoral care", mutual spiritual help, except by following the way of this strange shepherd, who died to save.

If the following translation of the famous verse of Colossians is correct (Col. 1 : 24) : "I rejoice in my sorrows, for, in my turn, I bear the remainder of the sufferings which come from the presence of *Christ in my flesh*, for His body the Church, whose pastor I have become"<sup>1</sup>, we do not perfect the redemptive sufferings of Jesus Christ, the one "great Shepherd of the sheep" (Heb. 13 : 20), but we do not retreat before the sufferings of the battle, which are brought upon us by His presence in us, if we desire to follow in His steps as "pastors" of our brothers.

*The apostles as founders and fathers of the churches, as examples for the flock and as fellow runners in an unfinished race, according to the Epistles*

The mutual spiritual help which was perfectly performed for men by Christ, who knows His sheep and gives His life for them, must now take shape within the Church. In one way the times of Jesus correspond with those of the patriarchs : the patriarchs were completely turned towards God, and Jesus Christ completely given to men. But now, as in the time of Moses, there comes the necessity of ensuring the extension of this contact, this covenant, to all men called by the Eternal. The lists of ecclesiastical offices in the Epistles thus correspond with the Mosaic institutions. The first of these offices will be that of the apostles. They are the original witnesses of Jesus Christ, and by that very fact the founders of the Church, those who plant it in the earth of mankind like a seed which has been directly put into their hands. This is why the apostles consider that they bear complete responsibility for their churches. Amongst the Corinthians, Paul looks upon himself as their "father in Christ Jesus through the Gospel" (I Cor. 4 : 15) ; he regards them as a girl whom he himself has "betrothed to Christ as a pure bride to her one husband" (II Cor. 11 : 2). Here and in many other passages is shown, as we think, the special position of the apostles, for whom evangelism is based on first-hand knowledge, while in our case it will never be

<sup>1</sup> Translation proposed and supported by Maurice Carrez in "*Souffrance et gloire dans les épîtres pauliniennes*". *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse*. Strasbourg 1951, No. 3, pp. 343-354.

more than second-hand, as it is precisely on the apostolic word that we base it. The apostles "bear witness", while we "confess" that this witness is true<sup>1</sup>; thus it is that the apostles can say that they are other men's "fathers" in the faith. But we must be more reserved. We pass on to others our certainty, our help, but we could never set ourselves up as their spiritual fathers. To forget here that the apostles could express themselves as they did by virtue of their position as apostles, and only by virtue of that, would be to allow mutual spiritual help to degenerate into excessive paternalism and illegitimate ascendancy over other human beings.

On the other hand, the apostles receive as pastors two other titles, which may be exactly applied to us, with their double character of extreme assurance and extreme modesty.

First, the apostles say that in the matter of mutual spiritual help we are to be "examples" for the flock (Phil. 3 : 17 ; Tim. 4 : 12 ; Titus 2 : 7 ; especially I Peter 5 : 3) so that others, those in our care, may be urged to "imitate" us (I Cor. 4 : 16, 11 : 1 ; I Thess. 1 : 6). It is completely impossible to give pastoral help to men if one does not strive continually to give a "good example" oneself, to persuade through one's works ; not, of course, that our works are the agents of conversion, but they may either, in a negative way, destroy the work of God, or, positively, reveal it, so that men render glory to God (Matt. 5 : 16).

But if we must set ourselves to become an example to those who will imitate us, we should not forget the other side of the apostle's position : he is someone running in an unfinished race. If today he stopped running, satisfied that he had become an example which the rest of the flock will have difficulty in overtaking, he would at once have lost the race, one of those first who in a twinkling had become last, overtaken by all the other runners, whom he had perhaps taught through his own witness to confess their faith. St. Paul writes to the Corinthians both, "I run... lest after preaching to others I myself

<sup>1</sup> An article by Jean Bichon affirms that in the New Testament the word "to witness" (*marturein*) refers only to the apostles, while the word "to confess" or "to report" (*homologeîn*) is reserved for the other Christians, and therefore for us, as we are not apostles. (In *Foi et Vie*, Nov./Dec. 1953)



should be disqualified" (I Cor. 9 : 27), and "I urge you, then, be imitators of me" (I Cor. 4 : 16).

In these two utterances we find a complete picture of the "pastoral care" of the apostles : assurance and humility, a call to follow and an act of self-forgetfulness in one, all-consuming enthusiasm with utter sobriety. This mutual spiritual help, thus preserved from all false humility as well as from any breath of spiritual pride, aims, as in Mosaic times, at advancing and sustaining in their journey the believers who have been entrusted to the apostle. He both precedes them in the race, and runs at the same time himself, so that they are lured on by his *élan* and are not at any point discouraged by the apparent self-satisfaction of their leader claiming to have reached the finishing-post. The use of the race as an image in itself manifests the active rather than cognitive character of mutual spiritual help in the primitive Church. Sustaining others meant not so much finding an entrance to their souls as drawing them forward in the way of life.

This leading onwards takes on different forms, which together make up the originality of the spiritual life to which we are called by the apostles through the example of their lives and their restless energy in moving forward. One has to learn to experience submission as well as liberty, tribulation as well as glory, a trust to be kept as well as an expected inheritance. The moment one of the elements is lacking, mutual spiritual help is at once endangered. It becomes a school of resignation or evasion, a vale of tears or a refuge of indifference, gnosis or literalism. So the characteristic of "pastoral care" according to the epistles is certainly contained in the double affirmation : if a man avoids the Cross, he is not a Christian ; nor, however, is he if he has no need of his share of glory.

We see this mutual spiritual help making itself relevant to men of very different types : the shameless, the arrogant, the brazen and the idolatrous, the ignorant, the half-hearted and the weary, the faithful, the triumphant, beginners and waverers, those at peace and those richly blessed. It is true that the New Testament does not give us a manual of practical theology. It protests against the "conformity" of some and the "disorderliness" of others. But the very diversity of these injunctions,

some of which seem revolutionary and others thoroughly reactionary, always has its roots in the same profound motive : Cross and glory, endurance and deliverance. Thus it is that the mutual spiritual help of the first Christians has taken on, on some occasions, the character of a sovereign proclamation, a radical summons to repentance, to the acceptance of grace (cf. the sermon at Pentecost, Acts 2), and on others that of a humble defence, persuasive, peaceable and non-belligerent (cf. the speeches of Paul in Acts 24, 25, 26). Our own "pastoral care" will bear in mind these two levels, moving like the apostles themselves between "boldness" (the assurance of Eph. 6 :20) and a humble defence (the account in I Peter 3 :15), according to the persons, the circumstances and our own faith, but above all the sovereign inspiration of God.

### *Conclusion*

It has, therefore, been our opinion that in seeking the biblical foundation of pastoral care we should have to run rapidly through the part of the revelation which concerns human relations. We can no longer be the perfect natural helpmeet of our neighbour, and, if we did not keep ourselves in check, we would quickly inflict vengeance on him for our own difficulties. Nor should we be of our own free will his keeper. Nevertheless, God believes it possible that amongst His people there will be some who will lead the others forward as they journey together and who will become spiritual shepherds. But these leaders may also begin to domineer over the others, to such an extent that God Himself has to come and hunt off the bad pastors so as to take over the leadership of His flock. "I will surely gather the remnant of Israel ; I will put them together as the sheep of Bozrah, as the flock in the midst of their fold... the breaker is come up before them... and their king shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them" (Micah 2 : 12-13). Jesus will make this breach in the wall of fear which surrounds men and he will perish in the struggle to do so. But after Him it becomes again possible to go through this breach opened in the barrier of accusation, flight and hatred which Adam and Eve raised up between themselves.

None the less, he who would pass through the gap must at the same time pay the price of the battle and catch a glimpse of the glory which is its outcome.

To practise genuine pastoral care we must therefore follow in the steps of Jesus Christ and draw men onwards, not however finding entrance to their souls simply for the sake of so doing, but in order to bring them back into the ongoing current of their lives. Until the Kingdom comes, this obligation of leading on one's brother will never cease. As a matter of fact one is not a Christian if not in the sense of being the pastor of some of one's brothers. Jesus bears and saves them. But our part is to bring them back to the bosom of His people, the Church, as they journey. There will always be much dough and little salt, many who stop by the wayside and but a few Christians on the march, but, if the salt were to lose its savour, wherewith would it be salted ?



# The Pastoral Care of Christ through His Church<sup>1</sup>

FRANCIS HOUSE

Pastoral care is essentially the work of Christ in and through His Body, the Church. This is the main theme of this article. It is not directly concerned with the administration of the sacraments or the ways in which pastoral care is organized in different ecclesiastical traditions; and the methods by which pastoral care may be exercised in universities in the modern world are discussed in other articles. Our concern here is with the beliefs and convictions which inspire individual Christians to care in this way for their fellow men and fellow members of the Church.

## *New Testament foundations*

There are many different starting-points in the New Testament for a study of this subject. Thus one could profitably begin with the Gospel narratives of Our Lord's own relations with individuals, or with His call and training of the apostles to be "fishers of men" (see Mark 1: 17, Matthew, chapter 10 and parallels). Here I want to draw attention particularly to some passages in the Epistles. St. Paul reveals his deep convictions about this work when he exclaims: "My little children, with whom I am again in travail *until Christ be formed in you!*" (Galatians 4: 19), and when he writes: "Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and in my flesh I complete what remains of Christ's afflictions for the sake of his body, the church... Him we proclaim, warning every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, *that we may present every*

<sup>1</sup> The substance of an address given at the Federation Chalet on "Pastoral Care", in Finland.

*man mature in Christ.* For this I toil, striving with all the energy which he mightily inspires within me" (Colossians 1: 24-29, R.S.V.). Paul was not content with making a first evangelistic visit to a place, but with the continued growth of each local church and its members. (e. g. "They returned to Lystra and to Iconium and to Antioch, strengthening the souls of the disciples, exhorting them to continue in the faith, and saying that through many tribulations we must enter the Kingdom of God", Acts 14: 21-22, cp. 15: 41 and 16: 4-5.) Above all he believed in the power of intercessory prayer, as we can learn from the constant references in his Epistles to his prayers for his converts. (See Romans 1: 9, 1 Corinthians 1: 5, Ephesians 1: 16, Philippians 1: 4, and especially 1 Timothy 2: 1-8.) There is also much that is relevant in passages such as 1 Corinthians 12 and Ephesians 2: 19-22 and 3: 14-21.

Alongside these Pauline passages we may profitably set much of the message of 1 Peter, especially chapter 2, verses 2 and 5: "Like newborn babes, long for the pure spiritual milk, that by it *you may grow up to salvation*. . . and like living stones be yourselves built into a spiritual house, to *be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices* acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." The Epistle to the Hebrews also has much to offer for the enrichment of our thought and practice in this matter, e. g.: "For it was fitting that he, for whom and by whom all things exist, in bringing many sons to glory, should make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through suffering. For he who sanctifies and those who are sanctified have all one origin" (2: 10-13 R.S.V.; compare 6: 1 and 9-12). A great deal of the teaching of the Johannine Epistles is relevant to our subject, especially 1, 3: 16 ("By this we know love, that he laid down his life for us; and *we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren*"), and the whole of chapter 4. And the severely practical Epistle of James ends on this note: "The prayer of faith will save the sick man, and the Lord will raise him up; and if he has committed sins, he will be forgiven. Therefore *confess your sins to one another, and pray for one another, that you may be healed*. . . My brethren, if any one among you wanders from the truth and some one brings him back, let him know that whoever brings back a sinner from the error of his way will save his

soul from death and will cover a multitude of sins" (James 5 : 15, 16, 19, 20).

From passages such as these we can derive a vivid picture of pastoral care in the Church of the New Testament. It is a normal expression of Christian love. It implies a special concern for these who are weak in the faith. It consists very largely in helping one another to grow in spiritual maturity. It involves prayer and willingness to suffer on behalf of others. It is a very practical expression of our membership one of another and of Christ in the Church. But even this does not take us to the root of all this teaching and practice. This foundation is clearly revealed in the passage from Christ's high-priestly prayer recorded in St. John's Gospel, immediately before the prayer that we "all may be one" which we quote so often in the Federation: "As thou didst send me into the world, so I have sent them into the world. *And for their sake I consecrate myself, that they also may be consecrated in truth.* I do not pray for these only, but also for those who are to believe in me through their word..." (John 17 : 17-20, R.S.V.). Every Christian has his or her own part in this "sending", this apostolate. But in this passage the Word of Christ which is most relevant of all to our discussion of pastoral care, is "for their sake I consecrate myself". Whether we translate the verb in this great saying by "sanctify" as in the Authorised Version or by "consecrate" as in the Revised Standard Version and several other modern translations, we need to remember that in biblical usage the Greek word so translated denotes not only "consecration" in our usual modern sense but also "sacrifice". Hoskyns and Davey comment: "It is precisely this double meaning of the word and this Old Testament background that are, perhaps inevitably, obscured in the English versions. 'For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they themselves may be sanctified in truth' does not mean that Jesus achieved righteousness or exercised a strict moral self-control in order that His disciples might be granted a similar righteousness; still less does it mean that Jesus made Himself righteous in order that His disciples might possess an example for their active imitation. It means that the Son of God consecrated His blameless life as an effective sacrifice on behalf of His disciples in order that



they might be set forth in the world as the concrete righteousness of God (cp. 2 Corinthians 5 : 21) sanctified by Christ Jesus (1 Corinthians 1 : 2, and 6 : 11 ; Hebrews 10 : 10 and 29, and 13 : 12) and dedicated to the service of God, even to death for His glory" (*The Fourth Gospel*, 1st edition. Vol. II, pp. 597-8). This comment, and above all the passage from the Gospel with which it is concerned, deserve prolonged study and meditation by all who are seeking to understand the true nature of pastoral care in the Church. They bring out the basic truth that pastoral care is essentially the carrying out through the Church of Christ's saving work in the souls of those "who are being saved".

### *Christian practice*

The realization that pastoral care is fundamentally Christ's own activity in His Church makes the whole difference to the way we think of the part we are each called to take in that activity. Each of us is both the object of Christ's pastoral care (see John 10 : 1-18) mediated to us through our fellow members of the Church, and also a means whereby His sacrificial love is communicated to others. Inward acceptance of these facts will preserve us from any kind of 'superiority' towards others in 'caring' for them. We shall know that the insight and the love which such care demands are Christ's gifts to us, and that our own varied and complementary gifts of temperament and experience have been given us that they may become the channels of His many-sided love. We can rely on Him to know when to speak and when to keep silent, when to persist and when, as far as we are concerned, it is better to leave well alone. We shall be delivered both from inconsiderate haste, and from careless procrastination and cowardly half-heartedness in our approach to others.

The way in which we conceive the aim of pastoral care is similarly transformed. The aim is that men and women whom we meet may realize the vocation to which God is calling them : that Christ may be formed in them in His way and in His time. It is not merely an individual relationship of one person to another, but a mutual relationship in Christ of one member of the Church to another member of the Church. In quite practical

terms, we may be sure that in God's purpose each of us is called to help some particular people, and conversely that in God's purpose some particular people can help us as no others can. And this thought also supplies the right context for considering the question of respect for the personality of others, which always comes up in discussions of this subject. It is in no sense a question of moulding others to our wills, but rather of helping them, as we are called, to realize God's will for them. As Père de Caussade put it: "It is not so much a question of respecting the autonomy of a human soul, but of respecting the work of God in that soul."<sup>1</sup> "To respect the work of God" in a man's soul, means not only to recognize his need for "integration" and remedial care, but to help him, if God wills that we should do so, to live more fully to the glory of God, to become what he was created to be and to fill the special place prepared for him in the Church of God, both in this life and in the life to come.

What then are the essential means by which a Christian can exercise this kind of pastoral care for another? It is obvious that any kind of superficial activism is out of place. Study of the New Testament practice and the experience of the Church down the centuries suggests that there are in fact two inter-related means of universal application. The first is prayer and the second is sacrificial sympathy. St. Paul was one of the most active of Christian missionaries, but it is clear from the Acts and from his letters that the main means by which he cared for his churches most of the time was by prayer. This was not only a practical necessity, but a direct recognition of God's sovereignty in all this field of care for the nurture of the individual soul. Similarly a great director of souls in the modern world, Dom Columba Marmion, made a rule to spend a whole day each week in prayer for his spiritual children. And even the humblest beginners in the Christian way, like myself, know from experience that when we have been praying for people, we are often given most unexpected and unforeseen opportunities for helping them. At least we know enough to be aware

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Prof. Benoit of the Protestant Faculty of Theology at Strasbourg in a valuable treatise on pastoral care and spiritual direction in the Protestant churches.

of something of the weight of our sin against the Body in not praying as we should, and in consequence missing opportunities in personal relationships of which we are only dimly or belatedly aware.

Preaching on the Advent theme, Professor James S. Stewart of Edinburgh said recently: "The great principle that runs through life is this — you cannot help a man unless you get right alongside him where he lives. Caring for people is always linked with sacrifice. If you really care it drains the virtue out of you, for it means you feel other's burdens as your burden: their troubles and defeats and complications become your own. The message of Advent is that God Himself submitted to that law. 'He was made sin for us!'" (from an unpublished broadcast). There is little need to add here anything more than a reference back to the Pauline passages quoted in the first part of this article. There is no easy, costless way of carrying out the share in God's care for His children which He calls each of us to undertake, and the cost is often paid in a deepened capacity for entering into the sufferings of other people. This is how we shall know in ourselves the truth of the saying: "If one member suffers, all suffer together; if one member is honored, all rejoice together" (1 Corinthians 12: 26, R.S.V.).

The argument of this article can thus be summed up in three sentences: First, we cannot rightly consider pastoral care at all without constant reference to the work of Christ; secondly, pastoral care is, above all, the way in which we ourselves are privileged to begin to enter through prayer and sacrifice into that redemptive work of Christ; and thirdly, we exercise pastoral care not simply as individuals, but essentially as members of the Church.



# The Priesthood of all Believers

MIKKO JUVA

As we read in the Gospel of Saint Luke, between His resurrection and His ascension Christ said to His disciples: "Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead and that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. We are witnesses of these things. And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you." At the moment of its foundation the Christian Church was commissioned to proclaim to the world the good news of Christ, of His work and His victory and the meaning of this victory for every man. Still today this is the most essential and important task of the Church. It is its main characteristic. We have, however, to admit that it is not a fact that every part of the Church gives an effective witness to the world, nor has it always done so. But that is a sign of sickness and death in the Church. Neither a correct theology nor a rich liturgy nor active life in its congregations have been able to keep the Church alive when this one thing was lacking: proclaiming the Gospel to those outside; announcing the Word of God to the world around; evangelism and pastoral care. The times when the Church has been inwardly great have always coincided with the times when it has been active in evangelism. Only the witnessing Church has been a living Church.

## *Priesthood and evangelism*

But it is also true that only a witnessing Christian has been a living Christian. If we attempt, upon receiving good gifts from God, to keep them all for ourselves, without sharing them with others, we soon lose ourselves the capacity to receive. Evangelism springs from the gratitude of the Church and from its participation in God's grace and the forgiveness of sins, but this gratitude is equally the matter of every Christian individually as it is of the whole Church together. Thus, witnessing is the task of an individual Christian as well as of the whole Church. Here is the expression of the priesthood of

all believers. In every place where the Word of God is rightly preached and the sacraments administered, and, through them both, one and the same Gospel awakens men and brings them into the kingdom of Christ, there the Church is active. Christ Himself extends His Church through His Spirit, but as His instruments He uses men, believers. Where the Holy Spirit has awakened faith, faith in its turn influences man's relationship with his neighbour. The man who has received much from God cannot help giving to others. This is what Luther meant when he said that the Christian "should be Christ to his neighbour". What Christ has done for us we are called in our turn to do for our neighbours. This "being Christ" goes as far as sharing the greatest spiritual gifts: when a man brings the Gospel to his friend, he can mediate to him the greatest things Christ has given to him: forgiveness, salvation, life and freedom.

Thus the priesthood of all believers has its part in the word of the Lord to His disciples, when He sent them to preach the Gospel in the villages of Palestine: "You received without pay, give without pay" (Matt. 10: 8). The principle was presented anew by Luther, and accepted by all the churches of the Reformation. Among the various traditions it has been applied in a broader or in a narrower sense. On the one hand, the authority of the Church has been considered to be centred in the office of the Church, the office of the bishop and the minister. Those in office are specially called to serve the Church and to administer its means of grace, the Word and the sacraments. In them the functions of the Church are personified, and thus they are also mainly responsible for evangelism or pastoral care. In other cases a ministerial office has been considered unnecessary and every Christian has an equal chance of serving the Church in all its various functions.

### *Minister and layman*

In this connection the views of various traditions and their justification cannot be considered in detail. We shall make an attempt to approach the problem practically. The Church is active where Christ acts through His means of grace. Thus everywhere where faith is born in a man's heart the Church is active. It is not possible to dismiss the fact that church history

shows laymen being instruments in this work as well as ordained ministers. In the same manner pastoral care and absolution by laymen have led men to genuine liberty and faith. If, on the other hand, many Christians have found significance in an ordained minister, with his apostolic authorization, performing this service for them, we are not justified in considering this form of confession as the only possible one, no more on the basis of Christian experience than of biblical exegesis. On the other hand, it has to be remembered that not just anyone is suitable for giving absolution. Absolution is no pastoral therapeutic method : it is always grounded on the special authorization Christ has given to His Church, and it cannot be performed without participation in the Church. Not all pastoral care ends in absolution. But where a Christian, be he ordained or not, practises pastoral care, he must be prepared to give a clear and unconditional word of absolution if the need arises. God's forgiveness exists before absolution, before preaching, before the administration of the sacraments. To mediate this forgiveness, that is to perform the office of reconciliation (II Cor. 5 : 8), is the aim of all the Church's witness to Christ. It is impossible to divide this office into two parts which are different in principle : those of the minister and the layman.

Also, from another point of view, the priesthood of all believers can shrink into insignificance. The belief, good in itself, that one's earthly calling has been intended to be carried out in obedience to God, has often led to the thought that fulfilling this honestly is enough for a Christian. But stressing this temporal calling leads to specialization in the realm of the Church. Ministers are specialists of religious matters : let them take care of preaching, of pastoral care and of winning new members. It is enough for the ordinary Christian to try to follow right Christian principles in his everyday work. Every well performed work is worship of God, and, as such, already as valuable as the spiritual work carried out by ministerial "experts".

### *Conflict of Church and world*

To look on one's earthly calling as a hindrance to the carrying out of the priesthood of all believers — which is a crude misunderstanding of the Reformers — is, none the less, not



often the real reason for neglecting evangelism and pastoral care. No other activity of the Church, except perhaps in certain cases its prophetic function, leads into such open conflict with the world, as just evangelism, witnessing. Works of love, service to the word, *diakonia*, mostly are accepted by the world. At most they may just knock at its conscience. Prayer and worship are, of course, useless in the eyes of the world, but they have a certain solemnity lent to them by tradition, and they don't usually bother anybody! One can always keep religion a private matter. But evangelism aims straight at a change, conversion, and it contains a judgment of the works of the world, and announces to it repentance. Right here, the conflict of the Church and the world is felt most strongly. Conflict is always accompanied by suffering and labour. The world will never receive the Gospel simply as good tidings, because these are and remain contrary to the wishes of flesh and blood, that is, to man's natural desires.

To avoid this conflict and suffering, Christians have often brushed aside the priesthood of all believers. It is easier to live in this world when one leaves one's friends and neighbours in peace, when one does not present to them for acceptance the uniqueness of Christ and the absolute claims of the Gospel, but leaves these things to be performed by the specialists, the ministers. There are two main ways by which this conflict with the world may be avoided, and both have been used often. The Church can conform itself to the world; it can then adapt its behaviour to the manners and ideals of the environment, and in this way lose something of its essential character as a community transcending the world; or else it can separate itself from the world, abstain from all real contact with men in the midst of whom its members live, and escape the contamination of the sinful institutions, manners and idolatries of the world. As contrary as these reactions are to each other, they lead to the same result. Neither of them leads to real conversation with the world, and thus cannot become a real challenge to the world's life. Both avoid conflict, suffering and the Cross.

*Inward conflict*

In this way the practising of the priesthood of all believers leads into conflict with the world, but also to conflict in the inner life of the Christian. It is impossible to witness to Christ without realizing what a shattering contrast there is between Christ's holiness and one's own sinfulness. The words of the Christian and his life are in sharp contrast with one another. Thus, evangelism also leads to inward difficulties. If we are trying to lead our friends to Christ, an easy peace with our own sin is impossible. The priesthood of all believers actualizes the inner tension of the life of the Christian.

Because of this, helping our fellow men with the Gospel is never easy, and it is not meant to be easy. It is not only that the Gospel is a stumbling-block for outsiders ; its proclamation is also always contrary to the natural wishes of the Christian. They also, like everybody else, desire peace and harmonious happiness, but evangelism leads them to labour, to suffer and to pray ; that is, to carry their Cross. It is often thought that Christian activity should arise spontaneously out of gratitude felt toward God, and when then nothing happens, we get dismayed and remain inactive. It is good to know that our old man will never permit us to evangelize. This task we always have to perform against him.

In the university milieu, some additional difficulties arise from the special situation of the student. He is, to a greater degree than either earlier or later in his life, independent of his neighbours. He is not responsible for the welfare of anybody else, and nobody is really responsible for his total welfare. Most of the things which he does, he does for himself, in order to bring his studies to a successful conclusion. The basic limitations imposed by life do not seem to reach to him as yet. Even he believes himself to be an independent man.

In addition to social independence there comes as a second factor the intellectualism of university study. The research man is the onlooker, who basically must not be interested whether things are this way or that way, so long as he can discover the fundamental truth of the matter. Thus, the student learns to take a cool intellectual attitude toward

things, and not only to those things he meets in the classroom, but also to those he meets in life. Rationalistic explanation, avoiding evaluation, becomes the most important method by which one defines one's attitude to things outside.

In this situation the Christian community in the university milieu is under a great temptation to accept the thinking and presuppositions of its environment and accommodate its activities to them. Disinterestedness and putting aside personal problems, which are the necessary conditions for reliable scientific activity, are no longer valid in the sphere of man's relations to God. We make a mistake when we separate out from the religious problem some aspects which may be treated theoretically, and because our fellow students are most eager to tackle these, if they discuss religious matters at all, we also take those as the most important sides of them. These questions are, it is true, often a very obvious starting point for a real personal contact, but let us not make more out of them than is in them. Because these often are the main points of contact we have with those outside, we may be inclined to think these the main way to bring the Gospel to them. This, however, is a huge mistake. We may get very beautiful results in theoretical discussions, without really, in evangelism and pastoral care, ever getting to first base. The purpose of evangelism is always that the Word of God gets hold of a person's life, and this Word is always personal. When the Word of God meets a man, there is little question about what is theoretically true or what is a misconception, but what is his or her relation to the truth. The Word of God is never amenable to being only the object of the student's scrutiny; on the contrary, the Word is always scrutinizing the student.

### *In the world but not of it*

Into this environment we are called to bring the Gospel. Christ sent His disciples into the world to live in it, but to live as His followers. The life of disciples is ordinary life among others, but at the same time life in faith. In the university we have to study and work and live completely under the same conditions as anybody else. We have to bear the same



troubles and difficulties, and we participate in the same joy and success. By taking part in our friends' lives, by sharing their problems, and by helping them in their most practical affairs, we can reach that contact that is the best and most effective starting point for evangelism.

But we must never forget that this human, friendly, social contact, like the intellectual contact mentioned above, is never more than a starting point. We are called to be good friends, but we are called to do something more, to love them, and that includes always bringing them the Gospel. We are called to tell them that Christ is the redeemer of all human life: that this our life, as student, scientist, citizen and father or mother can be lived, and is meant to be lived, in honesty, joy and freedom; to show that there is a third way between the sceptical acceptance of human selfishness and the desperate effort to follow some absolute moral standard, that is, the simple service of our fellow men through the power of forgiveness. That the last and final word over our existence is not biological egoism, but love which does not seek its own; that love never dies out and gets destroyed, even if empires and cities and cultures perish; that in every difficulty and affliction a man may get into, God's possibilities begin where man's end; that sinners receive forgiveness and the godless become the children of God; that the greatest joy and gift of life is to serve God, our Father.

*"To be Christ to one's neighbour"*

To bear witness to all this is the deepest meaning of the priesthood of all believers. Every man is called to "be Christ to his neighbour". Many duties in the Church are for practical purposes given to the pastors, but to help others with the Gospel is a privilege of every Christian. It is often thought that evangelism and pastoral care presuppose the same kind of thorough expert schooling, as, for instance, psychotherapy and a doctor's work in general. But this is a wrong "psychologizing" of life and faith. Christian pastoral care is not in the first place grounded in the skill and experience of the one who practises it, but in the fact that Christ himself is present when His word

is announced, when He is prayed to, and when absolution is given. In this way Christ Himself is the subject of pastoral care, not the individual Christian. Thus also, the core of pastoral care and evangelism remains unchanged. The words and concepts may and should vary, depending on the situation and culture our fellow men are living in, and the pattern of their philosophies, but the core remains unchanged: the message about God, who so loved the world that He gave His only Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.

In the modern world, and especially in the modern university, the pattern of thought, however, differs so radically from that of the Bible, that the very Gospel seems to be quite unintelligible to many or most people. Christian conceptions and words are strange to many of our friends, and even if they know them, they are just religious concepts, without any correlation to life itself. The message of what God has done seems to have no meaning, because people do not know what God has done, or could do, for and to them.

In this situation the only way of communicating anything of the meaning of the Gospel is often to bear witness about what Christ personally has meant and means to us. It is true that the word "witnessing" has got a bad reputation through many kinds of subjective testimonies, when Christians in a state of comparative emotional upset have told others about their religious experiences. This kind of witness has often been more a testimony about one's own religiosity and religious psychology than about Christ. Nevertheless, there is a fully legitimate, and in the Church often neglected, personal testimony to be given about what Christ has done for me. If our friends are unable, or unwilling, to see any marks of God's gifts and love in their own experience, the only thing left to do is to tell them what we have got. The bare fact that there are in this, our sceptical and selfish modern world, sincere and upright people who confess Christ as their Lord and Saviour, is in itself a witness to the world. The real danger is not that of a too subjective and personal witness, but that of a hidden spiritual pride. The Christian is called to witness to Christ, not to make his personal experience the norm for a true Christian life.

## Caring for Each Other in the University Community<sup>1</sup>

PETER KREYSSIG

Let me begin by asking a question: in what way is the whole problem of student needs related to the task of pastoral care which we have been considering in this chalet?

### *Needs are broken relationships*

I ask this question because it is not enough merely to register as many student needs as we can discover and then go on to the task of finding a remedy for them. We may too easily find ourselves in the situation of a doctor who elaborately treats the symptoms of a sickness instead of trying first to detect the cause that creates them.

It was with this question in mind that I looked at the theme you have given me, and two words jumped out at me and made me wonder: the words "University Community". Is there such a thing as "the *University Community*"? I should be surprised if the endless Federation discussions about disintegration in the university had not left some doubts in our minds about that.

From there I came to ask the question: could not most of the pastoral needs of students be analysed in terms of broken or damaged relationships of the individual person to the community or communities in which he lives, or lived before? Or, more precisely, to an upsetting of the precarious balance between man as a unique single person and the community of which he is a member? If this is so, we come to see that pastoral care deals with personal relationships rather than with

<sup>1</sup> Closing address at the Federation Chalet on "Pastoral Care", 1953.



the individual person regarded as the product of his milieu. (That was the direction taken at the meeting of the General Committee in Whitby in 1949.) Specific student needs may be defined as those of a person who is being torn out of previous relationships without being integrated into new ones that are properly balanced with regard to him as a person and his obligations to the community.

Consciously or unconsciously this need is felt not only by Christians, but by secular people in the universities as well. Attempts have been made to remedy this situation, but, before discussing these attempts, let us try to mention a few examples of relationships being broken by entering student life, or tensions arising out of it.

### *Old relationships broken*

The relationship between the student and his family may be severely strained, if not broken, particularly if entry into a university means for him entry into a new social environment. He is torn between a life of new freedom for his mind and a continuing state of economic dependence on his family. He takes up an entirely new rhythm of life, and gradually sets aside the authority of his parents or his teachers, under which he used to stand. This problem is particularly aggravated in universities where there is no tutorial system.

He enters, too, into a new world of relationship with the other sex. The girl, particularly in Asia, who has lived a fairly cloistered existence in her own home, is suddenly made to stand on her own feet. From the shelter of home or school, young men and young women alike emerge into an existence where new relationships demand of them a great maturity.

The student in a Continental university is left largely to himself, without spiritual and intellectual guidance, and he becomes a lonely individual. Right at the beginning of his student life, needs and temptations arise for which he is simply not ready. We should not underestimate the moral, ethical, intellectual and spiritual confusion which this creates.

*Misguided remedies*

A vast number of pastoral needs arise out of the situation of the student himself, but even more spring from the various attempts made in the universities to solve the problem.

In totalitarian countries, striking attempts are made to integrate the individual completely into the community. On the intellectual plane, everything is brought into obedience to a prevailing political ideology, such as dialectical materialism. On the spiritual level, this "political religion" expresses itself in self-examination, confession and absolution. While materially independent, on a generous state scholarship, the student has his time completely disciplined, and works in a relationship of sexless comradeship. It is no wonder that he ceases to be a person, and becomes a robot in a closely integrated university collective.

In the Western world, we are confronted by confusion. Let me select just one problem out of a vast field: that of the man-woman relationship. (I am grateful here to some thoughts of Krister Stendahl given at a conference in Sweden this summer.) This problem is particularly pressing in Central and Northern Europe. An attempt has been made to solve the community problem by introducing "corporate life". But since this life has no pattern of genuine community at its base, sex relationships become extremely difficult. In this kind of corporate life there is often a startling amount of "togetherness". Students of both sexes sometimes live in a more close and regular association e. g. at work and meals, in private study and leisure, than most married people can ever manage to achieve. The temptation to draw the "obvious" inferences not only economically (joint budget and housing) but also in physical relationship is therefore greater than many people can stand.

Thus it seems too dangerous a solution to try to fight the problem of individual loneliness by merely introducing "togetherness". The result appears to be a breaking up of normal student community life into a pattern of two and two. In some Continental hostels, which are little more than hotels, loneliness excites promiscuity instead of community. In the United States we hear of the whole elaborate ritual of dating, with

its fixed rules about petting and necking. There is too much "*Gemeinsamkeit*" without "*Gemeinschaft*".

Christians on their part tend to seek a way out of this dilemma by rushing prematurely into marriage. But this is not always a really honest way out. I do not want to overemphasize this particular problem, but I tend to feel that it is one of the biggest pastoral problems in the university.

### *The S.C.M. as a community*

These problems are shared by Christians and non-Christians alike in the university. We should not deceive ourselves: even our Christian problems of faith arise mostly in this field of human relationships, and much less in the intellectual sphere of grasping the meaning of faith. We should not only face this, but welcome it as a point of solidarity with our fellow students. It is essential for a proper understanding of pastoral care. We do not give the last word of Christian insight into a human problem, but we care for each other as sinners who have heard of God's grace and experienced it in our lives as students. To my mind this is one of the most important justifications for the existence of our S.C.M. in the university: its solidarity with other students in their peculiar needs, which make it singularly fitted for a pastoral task amongst them.

Perhaps I may indicate briefly some directions in which I think the S.C.M. should look as it tries to perform the task which we have seen to be its responsibility.

We must keep clearly before ourselves the fact that broken relationships, or tensions in them, are a result of human sinfulness. (Though it is possible for us to suffer from the sins of others without discovering a personal guilt of our own which directly causes the tension. This may be the case in the example we gave above of broken communities.) Sin distorts the balance between the dignity of man as a unique individual person and his relation to the community, wrongly emphasizing the one (resulting in individualism) or the other (resulting in collectivism).

Christ teaches us how the proper balance is restored in the restoration of our relationship with God. In His summary of



the Commandments, He said : "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Thus, the individual is addressed, and is referred at once for the sphere of his obedience to the community.

In a similar way, we receive the sacrament in community, but it comes to us individually. We can never escape the question : "Where is thy brother Abel ?"

Jesus Christ is the pastor. There is no path for us towards each other except past Him. Without Him, we cannot talk of pastoral care.

This means that the S.C.M. can never be a closed community. It is, in fact, a misleading question even to ask whether the S.C.M. community should be open or closed. It is a wide-open community, which nevertheless must preserve within itself the strength and vigour to care for each single person in it and to attend to his or her needs. *This* is the question, rather than the one about an open or closed community, which decides whether we are going to be a pastoral community or a pious collective.

A member of one of our discussion groups here has coined the motto, "Back to the obvious !" There is indeed no need for me to explain in detail what care for the single person means. Let us do what we know to be our task. We tend to live in our S.C.M. communities surrounded by a fence of Christian postulates. While we are discussing him, there may be one of our fellows dying of despair. Suicides are not unknown in the S.C.M.

### *The S.C.M. in action as a group*

First and foremost, the S.C.M. has to remember that it has no fellowship to offer other than that with Christ. This is the decisive factor in all its human relationships. This means that a decision is involved for any person who wishes to belong to the fellowship. We don't simply offer newcomers a nice community life ; nor do we offer them simply counselling, or good advice. We offer them pastoral care. If we do less than that, it is rather like staying indefinitely in the warm ante-room to the sauna, without ever going in to meet the real heat !

Our pastoral care must also have as its aim the building up of strong Christian individuals. We have to hand them on out of the warm S.C.M. nest to what is often a cold and draughty Church. Furthermore, our outreach to lost and lonely people outside who are community-shy may often have to be through individuals who are strong enough to go out by themselves and stay with them.

But pastoral care may not ultimately be disconnected from the life of the community. We find a rather dramatic example of this in Matt. 18: 15-17. Sin, which invariably damages communication between man and God and man and man, is not something to be dealt with merely between the individuals concerned and God. The community *as a community* has also a distinctive responsibility in the matter. It has to deal with it corporately, when in extreme cases the stubborn sinner is brought to face the whole community. It has a corporate responsibility in prayer, in binding and absolving the sinner — as the subsequent passages in Matt. 18 indicate (vv. 18-20). Individual sin is not a scandal to be hushed up by the congregation for the sake of keeping up appearances before the “outside world”. It is an opportunity to exercise corporately pastoral care in proclaiming God’s judgment and mercy, in casting out the wholly unrepentant and receiving him back openly with great joy when he returns to God’s forgiveness.

The forms pastoral care will take in each of our situations will be very varied, as the examples I gave at the beginning clearly showed. In a totalitarian university, it may be that our task is to help people to become persons again, to heal broken consciences by helping them to make an unconditional surrender to God’s mercy. S.C.M. programs will need to include much quiet, and meditation, and room for human encounter. Here our emphasis may need to be on the individual.

As far as the man-woman problem in the West is concerned, we have to help in a situation of ethical confusion. It is not simply a question of helping individuals obsessed with sexual neuroses, but of giving pastoral care by finding a pattern of community life which accepts the richness and value of being together and breaks through the two-and-two pattern. To

do this, we have to create a new atmosphere in hostels, meetings and social events.

While this problem is often evident in Asia too, the situation there is basically different. In India, where strong family ties still persist, it may sometimes be our task to help students to free themselves from them sufficiently in order to live freely in the world. Each S.C.M. will have its own problems, and must open its eyes to see them.

Let me close these remarks by reminding us all that pastoral care is not entirely bound up with tending to the needs and difficulties of students, but also with sharing their joys and moments of happiness. We have certainly done less than half the work if we accompany them passionately through the anxieties of pre-examination periods and leave them afterwards as a doctor dismisses his case after a successful operation. Pastoral care is not only therapy but also prophylaxis, not only healing but also prevention. In both it is a joyful task in which we keep discovering for ourselves how forcefully God works through His love and care, and how richly He fulfils the promise that He will never leave us alone if we turn to Him in our need and joy.

## Nurture and Witness

BY DR. KYAW THAN

It is not too often that the Student Christian Movement<sup>1</sup> is thought of as an association of people, the majority of whom are either late teen-agers or those in their early twenties. In our fellowship there are members with many backgrounds. We do not become members of the Student Christian Movement because of special religious insights, but rather due to our readiness to subscribe to its Christian basis, and join in its sustaining fellowship. There are many of us who come from homes where religion is not particularly of special interest. In Asia many of us in the S.C.M. are those who come from totally non-Christian homes. Then in many countries after the Second World War, the stable and normal parish and Christian home life which contributed a great deal towards the Christian education of each generation that grew up within it, had been either disrupted or thrown into a state of flux, due both to war and the aftermath of war. Hence we cannot ignore the fact that in some countries many of the members of the S.C.M. are not only late teen-agers or those in their early twenties, but also those who, due to disruptions in society and nation, have not had a chance to undergo a normal period of instruction in faith or Christian education during a developing stage of their life.

One may even set aside these abnormal situations and conditions and dwell mainly on the average life of a student on the campus. A couple of years previous to entering the university, the young student has studied at a secondary school. Generally, such secondary schools being more numerous than the universities, the young pupil attends school in his own home town. From the environment of parental care and secondary school discipline, in some cases the young person moves out to a metropolis or a city with a university. Firstly he has

<sup>1</sup> The term Student Christian Movement is used here in a broad sense to denote all types of campus associations and groups of students organized on a Christian basis.



come away from the environment of "home" and parental guidance. Then the university has its own notions of discipline, quite different from those of a secondary school. It normally expects maturity and consciousness of responsibility on the part of its members and leaves them on their own to face life and its varied struggles. Many voices on the campus claim the attention and allegiance of the students. Often the "busyness" and claims of campus life can easily prevent the young student from keeping up with his or her own growth in faith, or these may even undermine the religious discipline, weak as it may have been, which might have been attempted and followed in the pre-university days in the environment of a Christian home.

Taking such factors into consideration, it cannot be denied that a substantial part of the function of the S.C.M. must be devoted not only to the quickening of the intellect of its members but also to a great extent to the spiritual nurture of those with whom, through membership, opportunities of regular contact has been granted it.

### *Nurture and growth in the spirit*

Some may question whether this responsibility for the spiritual nurture and growth of students is more properly the pastoral task to be performed by the Church, and whether the Student Christian Movement as such is qualified or equipped to render such services. But we have often described the S.C.M. as an "arm of the Church" in the university and there also have been on many a campus programs arranged by the S.C.M. which help meet some of the requirements mentioned above. Schools of prayer, university missions, retreats, religious emphasis weeks and prayer cells are some of the examples in certain sections of the national Student Christian Movements which result from a desire to meet the needs for spiritual nurture and religious education among students.

### *In the corporate life of the S.C.M.*

Schools of prayer not only help those of us who are young to understand the meaning of prayer but also offer opportunities for practical participation in group meditation, and for develop-

ing personal prayer life. The disciples of old approached Christ to teach them to pray and to enable them to develop that habit of personal communion with God, which they must have observed in Christ alone on a mountain or in the desert. God forbid that we in the S.C.M. should say these are elementary, obvious and personal matters which need no special mention, for it is often on such elementary and obvious matters that the life of many a student or even that of the so-called busy leader breaks down and meets frustration. In some colleges small groups of three or four members each night come together, forming prayer cells, to undertake a discipline of joint intercession and prayer for one another, for the witness of the Movement and for the whole life of the college. Instead of such groups becoming ingrown pietistic cliques, it is interesting to notice how new life has often emerged in their branches and how outreach work has been undertaken by their members even across national frontiers. The sense of sustaining fellowship and the growth in faith derived by young individual students through these humble groups are testimonies to the helpful possibilities of this aspect and emphasis in the life of the S.C.M.

Series of reasoned accounts or addresses to relate the whole Gospel story and to convey the content of Christian faith and doctrine, are also continuing means by which each generation of students, both members and non-members of the S.C.M., come to grasp further the meaning of their Christian life in the light of the biblical message. Often it may happen to be the first time that the young student comes to get a view of the message of the Bible in its completeness. Such presentations, of course, need not necessarily happen only during the times of "university missions". Through selected studies of the Bible, successive devotional talks or by some such means, the fundamental religious educational needs of generations of students can continue to be met.

Retreats offer time and quiet opportunity to students to really collect their thoughts together, examine their lives, to meditate on God's Word, and to seek to enter into communion with God Himself. The ordinary items of program offered by the S.C.M. may be just another type of seminar, tutorial or lecture outside the curriculum, while retreats may have alto-

gether a different approach to the religious life of students. In talking about the nurture of the spiritual life of our youthful members, my immediate concern is not primarily to crystallize Christian insights in philosophy of education, politics or church traditions, and about matters of applied theology. It is rather to draw attention to the crucial matter, which we often easily take for granted, of personally sustaining the grace that is already at work in each of us who is either willing or has come to accept the salvation made available by Christ. It may be artificial ultimately to make the distinction between "thinking" and "being". The S.C.M. is here not only to help its members to think Christian thoughts and talk about them but rather to help them live Christian lives. That is one reason why I have cited examples such as prayer schools, retreats and university missions, as distinct from conferences, discussion groups or general study circles.

### *In the personal life*

For the student, spiritual nurture implies receiving instruction and help from those in a position to render such service, and having personal daily communion with God, studying His Word and meditating on and obeying its implications in his daily life. Hence, nurture also implies discipline. With all the many demands of our university course, social relations on the campus and normal human proneness to laxity, unless we decide on disciplining ourselves for spiritual growth as we do for mental development, we often find ourselves totally incapable of keeping it up.

Taking seriously the question of spiritual nurture in the S.C.M. would involve reminding ourselves as members of the S.C.M. of the necessity of keeping up our personal and corporate prayer life, devotional and group meditation on His Word, and always seeking to lead others along with ourselves to His throne of grace. Personal prayer life observed scrupulously during set sections of each day should offer us opportunities to praise and adore our heavenly Father, to confess to Him our shortcomings and sins, to give Him thanks for His mercies and forgiveness, to intercede with Him for our fellow men and to bring before Him the hopes and desires of our student life.

A regular habit developed without legalism to study or even simply read and meditate briefly on His Word is another basic thing each of us cannot afford to forego. S.C.M. leaders can help to promote and further a community concern for these Christian habits in their local groups. Distraction and interruptions are bound to come, and no one need despair, but rather persist in humility.

But there is always a danger in talking about discipline. It savours of legalism. Instead of these acts of discipline remaining a means of ensuring our grateful response and of holding on to what God has wrought in us, we may slowly come to look upon the performance of these acts as related to legal codes, by observing and obeying which we expect a due reward from God. People may say that the S.C.M. with its frequent emphasis on intellectual problems can often harbour the modern successors of those Greeks of the New Testament days. While there may be objections to the intellectualism of modern "Greeks", there can also be alarm signals about contemporary "pharisees" who have a tendency to introduce legalism.

A miniature righteousness through law and a new doctrine of works can unnoticeably steal into our attitudes and lives, resulting in a form of pharisaism. Having said this, one may go on to maintain that concern for the spiritual nurture of the members of the S.C.M. and talk about personal discipline is important, since God who justifies also imparts His spirit of sanctification. It is He who says, "Be ye holy as I am holy," "Be ye perfect even as your Father who is in heaven is perfect." Peter counselled: "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may devour."

Furthermore in another place in the scriptures, God declares, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain." The call to bear fruits worthy of redemption and the call to perfection, holiness, sobriety and vigilance of course cannot be understood apart from the enabling and sanctifying spirit of One whose qualities and power are the terms of reference and means of grace for human beings.



*The fruits of salvation*

It may be that those who advocate some form of religious exercises, perfectionism and holiness are in danger of unknowingly allowing the doctrine of salvation through works to raise its head again. But it is also well to say that justification, which comes only by faith in the redeeming grace of Christ, is always accompanied by, and manifests itself in, sanctification in the life of the believer.

If that is true of the members of the Church who through baptism have declared their acceptance of Christ, how much more is it necessary to bring it to the notice of the members of the S.C.M. which is made up of those who already confess the faith, as well as those who are seeking the implications of both justification and sanctification. Sanctification implies nurture and growth. Its relation to justification, as someone has said, is like the relation of preservation to creation, growth to birth, and the subsequent life lived in fellowship to the sealing of the covenant of fellowship. It is something developing. It is "becoming" as distinguished from "being". It is not a receiving but an increasing. It is not a state but a movement.

*Nurture for witness*

Having said all this there can still be another objection to the idea of emphasizing "nurture" in the S.C.M. It can promote preoccupation with oneself and turn the S.C.M. made up of such members into an introverted community. Here it must be said emphatically that "nurture" is not the last word. Spiritual nurture of the student is nurture for witness. In fact it is impossible to separate the two altogether. To be able to witness, the young person must have spiritual resources, and basic comprehension of his own faith. Otherwise how can he witness, or what will be the content of his witness? Hence the talk about building up the spiritual stature of the student is based on the concern to help the student fulfil the Christian task of witnessing to Christ. At the same time, through witness the student grows from strength to strength as the development of his inner life enables him to reach out in faith to varied human

situations beyond himself. So also this outreach in turn provides opportunities to clarify his Christian thinking, and increase his spiritual experience. It is walking in the light, the regular personal communion with God put into action and expressed by love to our brothers that makes our thinking clear.

Since witness implies not only proclamation of the good news through preaching but also through living in its power, it does not mean that we should always be preoccupied with attempts to produce arresting and systematically irrefutable statements about the nature of the Gospel. We should rather be concerned about manifesting the gift of the Incarnation. In the Incarnate Word we see in our weakness the relation between "personality" and "message". Without Him we can be nobody and we can perform nothing. But it is also true to say that "we can do all things through Him who strengtheneth us". Hence, consideration of the task of nurture and witness in the Student Christian Movement should normally be centred in these issues of the relation between justification and sanctification, and the relation between the proclamation and the "incarnation" of the good news God revealed to us.

# The Pastoral Care of Students

JOHANNES HAMEL

My father — who was a student sixty years ago — once said to me, "We were all members of the Church, but if someone had summoned us to attend a service of worship, we should have refused indignantly, thinking it really a bit too much." That was, then, the attitude of students in the imperial Germany of the nineties! It was not "done" to read the Bible at the university. This was not to be wondered at, even though most theologians made efforts to commend the value of the scriptures to modern men by a great variety of "reasonable arguments". A no smaller section of those professors of this generation whose function it was to lecture on the Bible, resembled that famous professor of Old Testament, Wellhausen, who in the last lecture of his life stepped on to the rostrum with the empty cover of a Bible in his hand and cried in a piercing voice, "That, gentlemen, is what I bequeath to my successor."

## *Mutua consolatio fratrum*

It was no wonder that that generation of students did not talk about "Christianity". It would have sounded immodest and impertinent, even indeed sectarian. Even in their old age these academic people did not dare to touch on religious themes in their conversation. I think of a professor of theology whom I respect greatly, who was a student about 1900, and who was asked a question about Jesus' saying in Matthew 18, "But if thy brother sin against thee, go, show him his fault between thee and him alone...". The only reply he could make was, "But of course such things don't really happen." It was, admittedly, probably true that this man did not suspect that in that very university precisely those things, and similar ones, did happen, of the reality of which he had only read in the

Bible! In the twenties it was increasingly the case that students asked for words of forgiveness and admonition to be spoken personally to them, because they were shaken and disturbed by the message of God in the Bible. Thirty years ago there were one or two professors at every German university in whose hours for private interview students asked questions about the grace and mercy of God, wanting an older person to pray with them, putting his hand on their heads and saying, "Your sins are forgiven." Thus in those days one went to Schlatter and Heim, to Schniewind and Fezer, to mention but a few names, hungry for the living speech of God to the person imprisoned within himself. But it was precisely in the thirties that this *mutua consolatio fratrum* (mutual brotherly admonition and comfort), as Luther called it, was practised in the fellowship of the S.C.M. I learned the meaning of confession not in the Church, but in the D.C.S.V. (German Student Christian Association) in Tübingen, as I did also that of discussion guided by the Bible, in a small group where prayer was offered and intercession made. It did indeed often happen that an older student approached a younger one about some hidden trouble which he sensed in him, or a freshman confided in an older student whose joy in reading the Bible he had noticed. The student pastor, generally appointed on a part-time basis by the *Landeskirche*, was mostly a lonely man, to whom it was not "done" to go. The pastoral care of students was carried out more by individual professors and the older students.

### *Totalitarianism*

This situation changed during the Nazi period. A time began for students in which decisions were demanded of them for which they were not sufficiently mature in years. If I see aright, this time is not yet quite past, at least in the eastern part of our Fatherland: young people between eighteen and twenty-three are confronted with situations where real and enormous demands are made on their faith and their patience, their love and their obedience, in a way which is familiar to us from the pages of the New Testament, and, in a different but quite similar way, also in the lands of the younger churches of



the eastern part of Asia, in Mohammedan countries or in countries like Yugoslavia, Spain and Colombia. In all these areas faith in Jesus Christ our Lord and God means separation from a radically opposed environment, which, — and this is the specific character of the situation — throwing in every imaginable political method of education, propaganda and other techniques, manifests a passionate interest in preventing the Gospel from winning sway over young hearts. One can be deeply concerned about students growing up in such an environment. We do not close our eyes to the fact that the spiritual consequences of this "re-education" into communist morals are very trying for every Christian. But in so doing one must not overlook one fact: this "lonely" situation of the Christian student at the university, where there is no longer a general Christian "atmosphere", impels this young person in a very remarkable way to search for the core and essence of the Gospel, in obedience to which he must be ready to accept difficulties both small and great, anxieties, or even positive ill, or at least to run the risk of such things. When it may be that one has to give an account of oneself before the authorities for attending a student Bible study circle — even when no bad results follow — then one asks questions about the content of this remarkable book, since having anything to do with it may perhaps have severe consequences for the reader! And this questioning leads automatically to the *mutua consolatio fratrum*: questions of faith and questions of personal decision must really coincide for any student who is alert, and who in some way has been touched by the Christian message.

### *A brilliant young student...*

I shall never forget how, fifteen years ago, a brilliant young student came to me (I was then in charge of the student office of the Confessing Church in Halle) and asked whether he ought not to enter the "National Socialist Students Union", as that was the only means of receiving a very generous state scholarship, which would make it possible for him to continue his studies. He was an orphan, and poor. In this conversation we were both brought down to fundamentals, myself included,

although the question did not personally concern me. But who can give advice like this if he does not allow himself to be asked by God, along with the questioning one, what His will is? One is immediately shorn of all the "correct" theological arguments on which one can draw in less demanding circumstances. As this student was killed in the war, I can tell the rest of the story. I asked him if he were an honest National Socialist. At the end of the conversation he stood up and said that he now thought he knew the answer to the question he had asked me. His way, he said, was clear, even if he had to give up his studies. And thus this hour became for him the one in which he learned in a practical way to believe, and entrusted himself to his heavenly Father, who knows our needs. It was strange, but a few days later a professor approached me to ask if I knew a student whose faith prevented him from receiving a scholarship. He had received a promise of enough money for six semesters' study for such a person. We thought he was studying and preparing himself faithfully for life. It was hidden from us that he was, during his student days, prepared for his death, which he met as a believer, steadfast in the faith.

### *After the war*

That was the mark of the student generation which came up to the universities after 1945, after all the experiences of the war and post-war period: they asked with rare passion about the message of the Bible, as they would about the bread of life. Behind them lay the horror of the battle-fields and the air-raids, flight and the loss of their homes, the loss of their possessions and often, too, of their health and their parents, but above all the loss of an ideology of the state, which in its most recent, National Socialist, form had wrought the inward destruction of all abiding images of a German people, a German culture and civilization, a German history and a German state, so that this generation of young people lived in a spiritual chaos, led a sort of existence-in-the-void, and at the beginning were, over and above that, threatened by hunger, sickness and cold. It is significant that this particular generation — it has already been succeeded by another, the character of which is

not yet clear — came together in *Studentengemeinden* (student congregations) in which subjects like "Who was Jesus?", "What was the teaching of Jesus?", "What is the meaning of life?" and so on, were of burning interest. They had lost all, and sought therefore the one thing needful. In their parents and acquaintances they had seen all too clearly the cursed outworkings of lying for fear of men in the Nazi era. What other way of living is there? Where can we find the *power* which rules us more powerfully than the men who wield power? Where are we given the *freedom* in which, though subjected to men, we yet live freely as those who receive their orders in the last resort from somewhere else than the state? Where is the *message* in which we may believe, and in the power of which even our enemies are caught up with us into the realm of God's love for us, who are His enemies? What is my *duty* towards the fanatics of an ideology which is once more rearing itself up? Do I pass them by heedlessly and indifferently? Do I direct polemics at them and prove to them that Christians are right? Do I make an attempt to demonstrate to them, as they boast of their scientific methods, that they too make an act of faith and presuppose unprovable axioms, or that their doctrine has little in common with historical reality? Do I keep quiet when the new doctrine of salvation is produced in my seminar group, or do I reply? Do I participate in the "unmasking" of "reactionary" forces in the university and do I take my part in possible expulsions by voting for them? And if I think that I cannot, in the name of God Almighty, follow the crowd — then am I obedient to Him in my personal life? At this point a new questioning breaks forth from those who are publicly known as decided Christians, but are young in the faith, and are much more uncertain inquirers than their non-Christian environment can perceive. Am I then the messenger of the *mercy* of God, with which He has loved the godless by giving His only Son? Is there heard among my fellow students the joyful peal of the Gospel calling men to trust in God and to honour Him far above all men, and human opinion? How can I become an authentic witness of Him who is the Lord of the visible and the invisible?

*From layman to layman*

It can be readily understood that as a result of such inward and outward situations, which demand decision, conversations are sought which are centred on questions about the living God, about "fundamentals". This is where the student pastor in Germany finds his task, whether it be in speaking the word of the Gospel directly to the individual student, or in the counselling and training of a group of older students to render this service to the younger ones. For it is often the case that a young person reveals himself much more easily, and in fuller confidence, to a fellow student two or three years older than himself. Essentially, pastoral care in the *Studentengemeinden* is practised not by the pastor, but from layman to layman, as was also the case in the primitive Church, and as ought also to be the case in every normal Christian congregation. The Word, as it is proclaimed, touches the conscience and summons to conversion. When it is heard, there is born a questioning and a seeking spirit, which is prepared to listen to the brother who is older and more mature. Then, in groups of four or six, one reads the Bible, and comes to discuss questions of practical living in order to give, mutually, clarification, strength and admonition. We experience something of the truth that Christians are taken up into the body of the Lord, in which each member has its function under the command of the Head. Thus during their youth people become aware that they have been given by God in the congregation, and often as well through the congregation, a specific task, a piece of service, an office, and that their life's problem is the question whether they are faithful in that piece of service. It is quite natural that part of such service is made up of intimate conversations, brotherly comfort, and admonition pointing towards God. Some pay regular visits to sick students, others attend to the need for shoes, clothing or food, and others again look after financial help where it is necessary and distribute the money they collect without regard to confession or creed. Still others are concerned with finding places where convalescents can recover. Others collect food tickets for needy students. Others sing every week to sick people in the hospitals and prepare liturgies



for services. Another one will look for vacant rooms for students, another is in charge of the finance of the *Studentengemeinde*, another of notices of activities ; some are responsible for decorating the altar, others meet for regular intercession, others again are in charge of our five-roomed student home, and take thought as to how these rooms can be used in the service of the Gospel. I could go on much longer in the same vein but make mention now only of the *presbyterium*, a group of sixteen (including the student pastor) which is elected every six months. Every person in it has a distinct function, or else he is delegated to do certain things from time to time. The fortnightly meetings begin with Bible study together, and we take usually as our passage the one for the next Bible study meeting of the *Studentengemeinde*. *Mutua consolatio fratrum!*

### *The Lord is the Pastor*

The *Gemeinde* (congregation) with its service and its common life is the area in which there are opportunities available for mutual admonition and comfort. It might be compared with the air in which alone one can breathe. This becomes quite clear on the occasion of the regular elections to the *presbyterium* (we call it *Vertrauenskreis* — the group of trusted people). The whole group of those who attend Bible study meetings nominates candidates. Then the retiring *Vertrauenskreis* examines these nominations and has searching conversations with the candidates. Then the old *presbyterium* attempts to draw up a list of candidates. Finally a meeting of the *Studentengemeinde* is called and the suggestions, filled out by nominations it makes, are discussed in detail, and a decision is made. What spiritual discipline is necessary in order to speak in a group of over a hundred members (that was the number this time) of matters which become very personal, about the gifts and manner of life of the candidates ! And in this, one voice carries as much weight as the majority. It is the rule that agreement is reached in discussion before a vote is taken. If a minority remains, it has the right, if it has grave objections to the person elected, to bring the choice to the larger Bible study group for a final decision. It would be difficult to estimate whether many people

in these very election meetings are not led to see with special clarity that in the congregation of Jesus no other lord and no other standard rules than He, the Lord Himself, who also determines the way in which, in the congregation, people and gifts are sought and found for service, and office-bearers are commissioned.

Whatever happens in the congregation in the way of consolation and encouragement, of mutual exchange, of "pastoral care", is indeed only a witness to the pastoral care which the Lord Himself carries out in men's souls.

# Is Counselling Pastoral Care ?

HARRY G. GOODYKOONTZ

The editor of *The Student World* has invited me to discuss an intriguing question, namely, "How is the movement called Pastoral Counselling related to the concern the Federation is beginning to call Pastoral Care ?" This question calls for some definition of terms. It would not be amiss for the writer to state that he approaches this question as one who, as Professor of Christian Education in a small Presbyterian Theological Seminary, is responsible for teaching the subject Pastoral Counselling. The writer came to his present position after twelve years as pastor in state university towns, followed by five years as denominational director of Student Work for the Presbyterian Church, U.S. He writes, therefore, as one who has seen the development of both the Pastoral Counselling Movement and the Federation concern for Pastoral Care.

## *Pastoral care in the university*

It was at the General Committee meeting in Whiby in 1949 that many in the Federation first awakened to the fact that in its concern with the university question, with "the social struggle", with the evangelism question, and with the ecumenical problem, the Federation was neglecting the human beings who compose it. We had become more concerned with problems than with persons. We were so engrossed with big issues that we were forgetful of the men and women who compose the S.C.M. Though I have not seen the documents, I understand that since Whitby, both the General Committee at Nasrapur and the Study Chalet in Finland, last summer, have given considerable thought to pastoral care.

What is it ? In the pastorate, pastoral care is all that the pastor does to care for the individual members of his congregation. It includes the visitation of the sick, the ministry to the dying, the pastoral calling upon the families of the congregation, particularly in strategic moments. And, not least, it

includes the informal hearing of confessions on the part of Protestant ministers, as well as the numerous types of what is now called pastoral counselling.

In the university, pastoral care involves all that the minister to students, or the professional worker with students, does for the students, to help them face and conquer their own personal problems, to make the necessary difficult adjustments to life in the university, to hear the call of God to their life-work, to find their place in the plan of God, to become a creative member of the Church.

In the United States of America, back in the nineteen twenties, sociologists made a number of exhaustive studies of university students and their problems. By the middle thirties some of the more progressive professional leaders of the S.C.M. were becoming interested in what they called pastoral counselling. It was not very clearly defined by 1940, but by 1950 pastoral counselling was coming to have a technical connotation. In the thirties and forties, what was called pastoral counselling was often not a technical method, but rather a general concern for the personal needs of individual men and women. But by 1950 it had become a somewhat technical word describing one major aspect of the larger task called pastoral care.

### *Priesthood of all believers*

A fundamental aspect of pastoral care has not yet been mentioned. Thus far I have written as though pastoral care were solely the concern of the minister to students. Actually, however, pastoral care is the concern of the Church for its members. Each member of the Body is to be concerned for each other member, and for the whole. The priesthood of believers was intended to lead to "the mutual cure of souls on the part of laymen. Each man was his brother's keeper in a spiritual fellowship. 'Seelsorge aller an allen' (the care of all for the souls of all) aptly expresses this principle."<sup>1</sup> This has direct relevance for the S.C.M. The Student Christian Movement normally is not considered a Church, but it is an arm of the Church,

<sup>1</sup> JOHN T. MCNEILL, *A History of the Cure of Souls*, p. 190.



through which the Church seeks to evangelize the university world. Because, at heart, the S.C.M. is rooted in Jesus Christ, it becomes a fellowship, a communion of the saints, a genuine community of love. In such a fellowship, pastoral care is a supremely important phase of being. Here is the priesthood of believers, here is the mutual ministry of each for all and all for each. Here is that loving concern for each person which ought to denote a Christian group. In such relationships, spiritual growth takes place. Pastoral care is, therefore, an inescapable concern of the Federation.

But what is it, in essence ? Nothing more nor less than the effort to build men up in Christ, "that Christ be formed in you". I often say that the goal of Christian education is "to present every man mature in Christ" (Colossians 1 : 28). This likewise is the goal of pastoral care, for in many ways the two are synonymous. Ministers to students, and the S.C.M. itself, have the tremendous challenge of seeking to help each member to grow in Christ, to face and overcome his problems through the power of the Holy Spirit.

### *Not minds, but persons in relationship*

Pastoral care is finally a matter of relationships. We are to help persons to love themselves. For only as one loves himself can he love another. We are to help persons to love each other as Christ has loved them. We are to help persons to love God supremely, with heart and soul and mind and strength. Right relationships ! This is the magic clue to spiritual salvation and mental health. Rightly related to self, to others, and fundamentally, to God through Jesus Christ. Pastoral care is a "person-minded ministry" to the men and women in the university, whether faculty or students. It is a ministry which focuses on human need. It is the person, not the problem, that is of ultimate significance. University students are not disembodied minds, they are whole persons. The training of the intellect is important, but a man named Sigmund Freud reminded the world of a fact biblical theologians had never forgotten, namely, that a man's emotions are of more dynamic importance than are his thoughts. The more we study such

biblical words as *ruach* (spirit), *nephesh* (soul), *basar* (flesh, body), *pneuma* (spirit), *soma* (body), *psyche* (soul), *soteria* (health, wholeness, salvation), the more we realize that the Bible speaks constantly of the whole man, of the unity of personality, and of the dignity and worth of personality.

The concern for pastoral care grows out of the elementary fact that a follower of Jesus Christ simply has to be concerned with the welfare of individual human beings. If folk have problems, if they have profound personal needs, if they are thwarted, frustrated, aggressive, overly hostile, unduly timid, fear-filled, if they have rich but untapped resources, if they face life and find its burdens almost too much to bear, then they are in need of pastoral care. This is the age of anxiety, and we are living in "a cut-flower civilization". In our sensate civilization, values are twisted, moral ideals are often considered mere relative mores. Temptations assail today's university students as they did those of yore, in the realms of sex conduct, vocation choice, and personal integrity. In the age of the atom, many students have a dim and hopeless view of the future, and are prone to ask, "What's the use?" In every S.C.M., as in every Church, there are people with just such needs. The followers of Christ, in His Spirit, and by His Spirit, are to try to meet the needs of their fellows. That is the *raison d'être* of pastoral care.

In America, to meet the needs of students, and growing out of a guilty conscience for the mass production methods of higher education, most universities have some kind of counselling service. Through the counselling service, students receive aid on academic problems, financial problems, even more on intimate personal emotional problems. Some universities employ a psychiatrist to help in such counselling. The S.C.M. does not need in its counselling program to compete with or to duplicate such services, but sometimes an S.C.M. leader may counsel on a vocational problem a student who has consulted the professional guidance service of the university, who has all the necessary factual knowledge about himself, but who has no basic frame of reference from which to make a vocational choice. The Christian counsellor always has a frame of reference from which he counsels, even though he may not feel it necessary

to labour that fact. Good psychological advice has its place, but the spirit and motivation of Christian counselling are what make it the modern counterpart of the "cure of souls".

### *Pastoral counselling*

Pastoral counselling is the new Messiah in American theological seminaries. A generation ago it was Christian education. Currently a great idea is being run almost into the ground. While pastoral counselling is very important, in itself alone it is not going to solve all our problems, and seminary students need not only to become adept in pastoral counselling but also in many other aspects of pastoral care and preaching. Pastoral counselling, as it has developed in American seminaries in the last fifteen years, and particularly in the last eight, is just one aspect of the larger task known as pastoral care, and it has a rather technical meaning.

Pastoral counselling is a dynamic relationship between the pastor and the person being counselled, wherein the pastor helps the person in need to think and feel his way to an understanding of his own problem, to clarify his thoughts and feelings about his problem (and ultimately about *himself*), and to resolve to take appropriate responsible actions.

This is an overly simple definition. Seward Hiltner says, "The special aim of pastoral counselling may be stated as the attempt by the pastor to help people themselves through the process of gaining understanding of their inner conflicts" (infra p. 19).

Carroll Wise says that "counselling is essentially communication, and as such is a two-directional process... the important thing is what happens between them." (infra p. 11). The most recent book in the field, *The Psychology of Pastoral Care*, by Professor Paul Johnson of Boston University, contains a chapter on Responsive Counselling, wherein counselling is defined as "a responsive relationship arising from expressed need to work through difficulties by means of emotional understanding and growing responsibility" (p. 73).

Pastoral counselling is *not* the giving of good psychological advice, though sometimes that may be done. Basically it is

not the giving of advice at all. From the world of secular psychology comes a form of counselling which is enormously important among psychologists and preachers, called "non-directive counselling". The originator of the title, Professor Carl Rogers, has changed it to "client-centred counselling", which is a more accurate description, for no man can counsel another without giving some subtle direction to the process. But the enormous popularity of the general concept "non-directive" is a clear indication that in the counselling movement advice-giving is not a synonym for counselling. Because preachers are so prone to give advice, to say "Aha, thou ailest here and here, and I know the answer. Do this", some people think that preachers cannot be good counsellors. But many preachers do counsel, and do it without constantly giving advice and direction.

From the definitions above given, a few basic principles may be drawn which will help to explain what pastoral counselling is. First, however, let it be said that a wise and skilful layman can do pastoral counselling, but in general it calls for a skill that is professional, as well as a concern that is pastoral.

1. Pastoral counselling is a dynamic relationship between two persons, in which the pastor seeks to help the other person to help himself. In the tension that exists between the two as each endeavours to communicate thought, and primarily feelings, to the other, there is a process of growth toward self-understanding and the assumption of responsibility. In this relationship the counsellor is mainly a listener, though the listening is active, not passive. Only as he listens can he understand.

2. Pastoral counselling is rooted in a deep respect for personality. The pastor treats the other as a person of worth. Further, all confidences are honoured, not betrayed.

3. Pastoral counselling is at heart a matter of feeling — of feeling one's way with the other into his problem — and out of it. It involves empathy, a feeling one's way into the feeling of another. "I sat where they sat." "To understand a person's behaviour, consider the emotional context", is a fundamental principle. Yet in entering into the other's feelings, the counsellor must maintain objectivity. He feels with the person in need, yet he does not so identify himself with the one in



need that he loses the capacity objectively to understand the meaning of the feelings.

4. Pastoral counselling is carried on in a permissive atmosphere. The counsellor does not condemn. A phrase often used is "non-judgmental" thought non-condemnatory would be more accurate. The counsellor helps the person in need to know that he is trying to understand, not condemn. He helps the other person to feel free to talk about any subject, to express his inner feelings, to let out his resentments, his hostilities, and his bitternesses. When a student says, "I hate my mother", the counsellor is not shocked; objectively, without emotion, he accepts this statement as a fact in the life of the other. In fact, the counsellor accepts the other as he is.

5. Pastoral counselling seeks to clarify thoughts and feelings, that the person being counselled may grow to the point where he achieves insight into himself and "what makes him tick".

6. A Christian counsellor engages in counselling or in broader phases of pastoral care because the love of Christ is in him, and when he sees another in need, in the love of Christ he suffers with that other until together they find answers, receive insight, change attitudes, accept forgiveness, and grow in Christ-likeness. And, paradoxically and ideally, the counsellor does this and remains objective.

7. Finally, pastoral counselling seeks to help the person reach the place where he is able to undertake self-directed, responsible action.

In short, pastoral counselling is a therapeutic process in which the pastor tries to help the person in need so to come to himself that he will be able to solve his own problems.

Stated in this fashion, pastoral counselling raises some theological questions. While there has been a vast deal of writing about the techniques of pastoral counselling, there has been very little grappling with the theological questions involved. How does the preacher's training to "preach for a verdict" and to "preach positively" relate to the non-directive approach in counselling? How does the man of love accept hostility? How does the pastoral counsellor, representing the Holy God, deal with guilt if he is non-judgmental? And, deeper,

are such questions as, What is the place of prayer in the counselling process? Is the Holy Spirit in action in the counselling relationship? Does the fact that the counsellor presumably is a man of agape-love have any meaning in this regard? What significance for the Christian doctrine of man has the concept that ultimately a man must heal himself? Does pastoral counselling take either original sin or divine grace seriously enough? Several able men are beginning to make contributions that reveal not only a knowledge of the psychological language but also show a grasp of theology, historical and ecumenical.

It ought to be noted that a new fad called "group dynamics" is trying to nose its way under the tent in the theological curriculum. It is the other side of the current emphasis on pastoral counselling. It is a recognition of the importance of group life. Group dynamics is a strange mixture of ancient knowledge and modern psychological discoveries of the ways in which people interact in groups. It has a real message for the S.C.M. Love (agape) in action in the group (the ecclesia) must accompany the interest in the need of the individual. In fact, the S.C.M. is an ideal company in which to use the insights of group dynamics in order that in the mutual interchange of the group there may be found a genuine fellowship, a koinonia. In such a Christian group (S.C.M. or church) students in spiritual need may find mutual concern, positive acceptance, and unselfish outgoing love.

That the Federation is on the right track in taking seriously pastoral care is beyond question. And pastoral counselling is merely another human technique unless it is done out of a pastor's heart, from deeply Christian motives, and in the power of the Holy Spirit.

#### *Brief Bibliography :*

SEWARD HILTNER : *Pastoral Counseling*, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1949.

CARROLL WISE : *Pastoral Counseling*, Harper, 1951.

WAYNE OATES : *The Bible and Pastoral Care*, Westminster, 1953.

WAYNE OATES : *The Christian Pastor*, Westminster, 1951.

PAUL JOHNSON : *The Psychology of Pastoral Care*, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1953.

# Pastoral Care and Politics

WILLIAM STRINGFELLOW

“What then ? Are we Jews any better off ? No, not at all, for I have already charged that all men, both Jews and Greeks, are under the power of sin, as it is written : ‘None is righteous, no not one ; no one understands, no one seeks for God. All have turned aside, together they have gone wrong ; no one does good, not even one.’” *Romans 3 : 9-12.*

\* \* \*

It is pretence to speak of politics and pastoral care when in doing so the pastoral need of politicians is thought of as different in degree or in kind from the intrinsic pastoral need of every man.

Moreover, it is deception when the pervasiveness of sin appears mitigated by a milder vocabulary of pastoral care. Christian evangelism requires confronting the reality of sin, and “pastoral care” is not some new technique which Christians have lately developed, but a concrete description of evangelism.

## *Politics and sin*

The pastoral problem in politics, therefore, is coincident with the dimension of sin in politics. There is no relevance in pastoral care in politics which hides from that dimension.

Whether we do so hide depends upon our understanding of the nature of politics. It is common to say politics is the struggle for power to determine and administer public policy — for power to order man’s life in society. The critical issue in politics, consequently, is justice among those who contend for public power as well as between the powerful and those subjected to their power.

It is often suggested that Christians enter politics out of a concern for justice. This suggestion has seriously confounded Christian witness in politics.

It deals too lightly with the fact that justice is relative to political self-interest: having one content to a democratic partisan, quite a contrary one to a totalitarian, and a distinctive personal content to each man in his own political life. Moreover, it engages Christians in political decisions in terms of these partisan conceptions of justice, rather than in terms of evangelism, and it invokes the fiction that the justice men make in politics foreshadows the Kingdom.

In short, it concentrates so much on the justice issue in politics that it overlooks the presumption upon which the issue rests: that *man* can achieve justice, that *man* can solve his problems, that *man* exercises dominion over life, that *man* saves himself.

All politics — idealistic or pragmatic, democratic or totalitarian, "just" or "unjust" — is founded finally upon the same presumption, and it is in this presumption that the dimension of sin in politics is disclosed.

Sin is substantive in politics.<sup>1</sup>

### *Substantive sin and political morality*

Sin in politics needs to be distinguished not only in reference to the issue of justice, but also, especially in the United States, from political morality.

Americans tend to regard politics as a form of prostitution, and assume that politicians are bound to be liars, corrupted by power, self-aggrandizing, compromisers of principle, betrayers of trust. Yet this view is held in tension with a rather vivid expectation that sooner or later evil motives, evil deeds and evil doers will be swept away and replaced by righteous purpose, demonstrable morality and high idealists. That is why

<sup>1</sup> To suggest that sin is substantive reality in all politics, and that the Christian concern in politics is not human justice, but evangelism, does not diminish the importance of concrete political decision for Christians. But it does place the political decisions, affiliations, and participation of Christians in a different perspective: that of evangelistic potential rather than political consequence.



the concept of the "crusade" is a resilient one in American politics.

The absurdity of this notion is that it equates sin in politics with specific acts obnoxious to public conscience. By so limiting the conception of sin, it in fact conceals from men the substantive reality of sin in politics.<sup>1</sup>

I mention this to illustrate the pastoral problem in politics, of confronting men with the reality of sin whenever their prior understanding of sin has been capsuled in specific acts repugnant to public standards of political morality.

And when Christians join in condemnation of such acts, without at the same moment testifying to their knowledge that sin is far more than that, evangelism is obstructed.

### *The pastoral need of politicians*

I have suggested that pastoral care is a primary description of evangelism and that the pastoral need in politics is in the dimension of sin in politics. This dimension is disclosed, I believe, neither in the issue of justice in politics, nor in the problem of political morality, but in the common presumption of all politics that man saves himself.

I have said these things because I think they illuminate each particular pastoral need of a politician.

It is difficult to speak analytically of pastoral need because need is articulated in distinctive personal ways in each man's life and experience. In politics, not only is each politician a different person of distinctive need, but there are, after all, many sorts of politicians and various spheres of politics. Some politicians are technicians, some apologists; some philosophers and teachers, some figureheads; some scientists, some amateurs; some theorists, some pragmatists; some leaders, some followers.

Still, one may speak illustratively of specific pastoral needs in politics:

a) *Compromise* — Multitudes of politicians, if not, indeed, every single one, have need because of compromise. Compro-

<sup>1</sup> This notion has enough currency in the United States to create an enormous tactical problem for Christians in politics in how they criticize the concept of the "crusade", as expressed, at the moment, in the Eisenhower administration.

mise plagues the politician because it tests pointedly and ruthlessly his deepest motivation and intention in politics. It threatens his commitment.

A politician does not often express his final intention openly. Rather it is expedient to surround it, to clothe it, to disguise it from others so as to gain the support of those who would not share it. Yet the compromise of disguising it is a pretence which may become an unbearable disloyalty to the politician's real intention.

Moreover, compromise raises the problem of the different commitments of others in politics. A politician looks upon another politician as a potential rival — indeed, as a possible enemy. Can he compromise by forming a political alignment with his rival without encroaching upon the integrity of his own purpose? Or if he destroys his enemy, is this not compromise in some desperate form?

Compromise confronts the politician whenever his own deepest loyalty in politics is threatened, yet his use of compromise offers not a solution, but an implicitly more serious threat.

This is a problem in political tactics, but it is also a problem in pastoral need in politics.

There is no compromise in the Christian life; not because it offers a higher, more absolute motivation, but because compromise is irrelevant to the Christian. For where Christ is pastor — where Christ is Lord — reconciliation sweeps away the necessity of compromise.

b) *Power* — Power involves pastoral need. The premise, even though unarticulated, of one entering politics is that he has a right to power — by birth or ideology or training or physical force or tradition or wealth or labour or so on. This presumption is made against others who have made parallel presumptions that *they* have the right to power. That is why politics is struggle and conflict.

Yet the presumption is made in anxiety when it is realized that history does not vindicate it.

Here is a pastoral problem.

The Christian knows that the presumption is not justified in history for man does not have a right to power because of

what God has given him. Such presumption is made not only against other men, but against Christ, who has all power.

c) *Personality* — Few specific needs of politicians are more obscure to the onlooker than that in the problem of political personality.

In all kinds of politics, a demand is made by the public for evidence of their common identity with the politician. Some politicians, aware of this, employ it skilfully to strengthen their power and deliberately create a fictitious public image of themselves. If the President or Premier or the Leader is known to do common things or have common enjoyments, it establishes a more tangible relationship between him and his subjects. And in some degree the importance of a public personality for any politician is substantial.

Thereby the politician is confronted with a tension between his most direct knowledge of himself (which of course may be an actual distortion of his self) and his political image, between his "felt" personality and the feigned personality which bears his name in politics. How far can he remain the one and yet permit the other? How much is his public personality a symbol of his aloneness — of his isolation from others? And what does this tension do to a politician of deep charismatic tendencies?

Politicians confront such pastoral issues as these.

Before Christ personality is not feigned or felt, it is known.

Such comments, as I have said, only illustrate pastoral need explicitly in politics. There is far more to be said of compromise and power and personality in politics, and of the questions of authority, or of legislation, or of decision, or of judgment. And there is the untouched matter of how politics is, for some politicians, as vivid a form of self-fulfilment as music is for some composers. Yet in each concrete subject of this kind, the pastoral need in politics is disclosed again as evidence of the substantive sin of politics.

### *Pastoral need and pastoral responsibility*

There is no utility in any discussion of pastoral care which is simply a description of pastoral need. The subject of pastoral care is as much who meets the need as it is who has need.

Christians declare that as pastoral need is of sin, so pastoral care is of Christ, who overcomes sin. Christians acknowledge that as all men, including themselves, are under sin, so are all men in pastoral need, in need of Christ.

To name Christ as pastor of all men means that the pastoral responsibility of the Christian Church for the world is evangelism. Only insofar as Christians are evangelists in the world and among men do they share the pastorate for the world.

In such an understanding of pastoral need and pastoral care is a serious critique of much of what the contemporary Church calls by those names. There is a view among Christians that equates pastoral need with psychopathology, rather than with sin, and which asserts that pastoral care is essentially therapeutic counselling by the priest or minister, rather than the evangelistic task of the whole community of Christ in the world.

But the time is upon us to testify, without mildness and without mitigation, of the captivity of all politics in sin and of how Christ has broken the prison.



# Pastoral Care and Psychotherapy

J. H. VAN DEN BERG

The editor has asked me to write a short article on pastoral care and psychotherapy in which, amongst others, two questions should be answered. The first one was: How is pastoral care different from psychotherapeutical care, and to what extent do they overlap? The second was: What knowledge of psychotherapy should a person have who is concerned with carrying out Christian pastoral work? To my mind these questions should be answered only after putting a third question, which I would formulate in the following way: How is it that today these questions repeatedly arise almost everywhere? What causes these two forms of aid to be so eminently important at the present time? What has drawn them so close together that nobody really knows where pastoral care ends and psychotherapy begins, or, to put it differently, that nobody can tell if in the last analysis many forms of pastoral care are rooted in psychotherapy, or if psychotherapy at its deepest consists in unmitigated though camouflaged pastoral care? All things considered, we are faced with various questions, which, however, are closely connected, as we shall see. Their answer therefore will require some time.

*Why do psychotherapy and pastoral care rouse so much interest today?*

Psychotherapy as scientifically responsible inter-personal work has not, as yet, a long history. One may say that before Charcot (1825-1893), Janet (1859-1947) and especially Freud, nobody seemed to care for those patients who suffered from what we now call neurotic disorders. The two first physicians were, moreover, more interested in them from a psychopathological than from a psychotherapeutical point of view. Psycho-

therapy begins with Freud and therefore is not older than fifty years. If one now observes how this psychotherapy as a medical treatment has developed since the date of its birth, one statement only is possible: that it meets a great need. It should not be difficult to constitute a substantial library of exclusively psychotherapeutical publications. Journals mainly concerned with this subject are almost innumerable. How curious it seems that half a century ago all this was completely absent. Does it mean that a century ago science was so neglectful? Was there no interest for what today has become so clearly visible everywhere? I do not think this is true. Are we not invited rather to believe that our social life underwent a change that resulted not so much in the birth of neurotic disturbances, but certainly in their increase? We may ask ourselves whether these disturbances became more frequent directly before the time that Freud began to write his epoch-making works.

Meanwhile, in the course of those fifty years a change took place in psychotherapy that should not remain unnoticed. The first psychotherapeutical publications were only related to severely disturbed patients. Those of our day deal with normal people. The consultation-hour of the therapist hardly gives the impression that medical treatment is taking place. The patients — we call them preferably, and for good reason, "clients" nowadays — are for the most part people who carry on their daily affairs, performing responsible functions very often. They are not ill in the usual sense of the word, and yet they have good ground to visit the doctor. So many therapists, in keeping with this change, cannot be called psychiatrists but rather "clinical psychologists": specialists of psychic disturbances in normal people. Much of this work is done by social workers. I believe that our ancestors of the 19th century would stare if they could see the people who busy themselves today in one or another kind of psychotherapeutical work. Most probably they would not understand, and remark that we exaggerate boundlessly, whereas we know that there is no exaggeration whatever, that on the contrary there is a distinct shortage of specialized care for all those who have to struggle with psychic difficulties. What does this change mean? What is the matter with us that we become so early a prey to disturbances?

*The definition of pastoral care*

In pastoral care, too, a curious change can be observed. It is not as young as psychotherapy. The New Testament shows us many examples of pastoral care, and we have no reason to doubt that the Christian community has continued to practise it since its origin. But it was done in a way that does not seem sufficient to us today. The change we mentioned has taken place in the course of the last twenty years. As recently as 1933, Hans Asmussen in his much-read *Seelsorge* (pastoral care) writes that pastoral care consists in a preaching of the Word to the individual. To his mind pastoral care means a sermon in which the pastor leaves his pulpit, and instead of addressing the congregation, turns to the individual man or woman confronting him. Thus pastoral care can be no conversation: all reciprocity is excluded; the pastor announces the Gospel; his audience can merely accept or reject his words. Any form of education, of inter-personal care, guidance, therapy, etc., is dismissed by Asmussen as a work essentially foreign to the pastor, though he does admit that this inter-personal aid has its merit.

This definition of pastoral care is less and less endorsed by experts. The pastor of today knows too well that care as Asmussen defines it very often cannot have an effect on men. They need a conversation. It is typical that Thurneysen in his splendid work (*Die Lehre von der Seelsorge*, 1946), calls pastoral care a conversation: a particular conversation, a conversation characterized by a remarkable watchfulness and a remarkable earnestness — and by a certainly no less remarkable cheerfulness — but all the same a conversation; a communication. Again I believe that 19th century pastors would wonder if they read this. They would wonder still more if they could be present at such a conversation. For they would hear the quite ordinary things of life mentioned: talk about the education of children, university matters, engagement and marriage, the difficulties and joys of old age. To the outsider it would appear that the conversation is exclusively concerned with those matters, and yet it may prove to be a pastoral conversation *par excellence*. The 19th century pastors would be on their chair's edge to

preach the Gospel, and realize with alarmed dismay that the modern pastor often confines his efforts to this mere "conversation". He puts himself, or should put himself, quite simply among his fellow men; he helps where it seems to him he should do so, which does not mean that he leaves it at that; but the emphasis of his task is laid on the ordinary, daily human way of helping. He is careful not to use the Word before he has been able to make it visible in his deeds. He is in a certain sense social worker, counsellor, psychologist, psychotherapist if you like, though constantly something else besides. For is he not pastor and precisely not a psychotherapist, though it is hard to say in what his pastorate consists? It is just as hard to say why the social worker, the clinical psychologist and the psychotherapist are not pastors. For they are not. Or can they be called so in a certain sense?

How are we to describe the change in pastoral work? Has the pastor gained a new insight into his task? Have former pastors wrongly understood this task and mishandled it? Or have the people he meets changed? It seems hard to accept that only now at last, after nineteen centuries of pastoral care, its substance begins to be recognized. Just as even the fact that today more than in past times so many sane people consult the psychotherapist seems to indicate that humanity has changed, the nature of pastoral work today seems to point in the same direction. Let us therefore stop a moment and consider how people live today. Thus we hope to gain an answer to the question why so many otherwise healthy and effectively working people get into trouble and go to consult a psychotherapist or a pastor.

### *Puberty in modern times*

The psychic disturbances that characterize modern man are preferably defined as a lack of adjustment of the personality to its environment that seems to have its origin in disturbed development. There is reason to ask therefore what particular feature in the development of the personality strikes us today. In other words: there is reason to inquire into the relation of maturity and youth.



The characteristic of growth into adulthood in the present day lies, in the opinion of many people, in the adolescent's capacity to give shape to the various forms he meets in human life. Compared to former times our social life is strongly polyvalent, by which I mean that in different milieux the same institutions and the same events may have a totally different meaning. The child gets acquainted with this polyvalence when he reaches school age. He enters into a veritable chaos of opinions and points of view. His friends have a different faith or no faith at all, some of his comrades fold their hands and say grace before meals, others make the sign of the cross, and others again begin to swallow their food without waiting for the arrival of the other members of the family. The child comes into contact with families where the marital relation is good, while in other families it is bad, and where sometimes the parents are divorced; where one friend every other week or month visits his father who is married and lives elsewhere and has children whom the child of the first marriage can call or not call his brothers and sisters. One of his comrades has two mothers, another one has four parents. The child enters into families with free sexuality; the mother walks through the house as a modern Eve; in other surroundings the slightest allusion to sexuality is taboo. A few years later the child gets acquainted with a chaos of political, religious, social and ethical opinions. He does not find anywhere a norm accepted by all. We adults can hardly guess with what pains the child finds its way in so diverse a world. For adulthood means precisely that we take up a monovalent position among the many polyvalents that surround us. A monovalent position which, notwithstanding, is so little one-sided that we hardly collide with the numberless different opinions and points of view, a position so carefully chosen that in this polyvalent world we can react adequately, or in other words that we can do our work in it as beings who are adapted to it.

In her book, *Coming of Age in Samoa* (1928), Margaret Mead describes the life of children who on that island grow up in a rigorously homogeneous monovalence in a strongly stylized culture, and where, in contradistinction to our children, they do not have to choose between different religious, moral and

socio-ethical forms and principles. The author relates this phenomenon with the stupendous fact that on Samoa no neurotic disturbance can be traced. We have our suspicions about why this is so : if adulthood represents one form generally accepted and realized by all it cannot be difficult for the child to come of age. Disturbances in its growth are thereby practically excluded. Neurotic disturbances are hardly imaginable. Margaret Mead mentions another striking phenomenon related to what we have just said : a psychic puberty does not exist in Samoa. Through this period of their physical coming of age, children in Samoa do not go through a period of loneliness, change of moods, extravagant conduct, resistance to their parents, etc. This period we call by agreement psychic puberty, and up till a short time ago we thought it was a characteristic of adolescence in general. In Samoa the child participates very early in the life of the adults. From the time children are four or five years old they perform definite tasks according to their strength and intelligence, but still tasks which have a meaning in the structure of the whole society.<sup>1</sup> We need to know our young people only slightly in order to realize that this picture of adolescence does not apply to our Western culture. Our social relations are so complicated that we could not allow any child to participate in them.

### *The arrival of adolescence*

There was a time when the child in our part of the world grew up in a considerably more uniform society. I think for instance of the period in between the Renaissance and the French Revolution, when, certainly as regards the countries of Western Europe, a clear, uniform style of life prevailed. It is very probable that adolescence as we observe it in our children was lacking then. But we know little about it. Historical documents which might have shed light on this matter are remarkably scarce. This lack of hetero- or autobiographical notes about the period of coming of age shows that this phase of life must have passed unnoticed, simply because at the time

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*

there seemed to be nothing striking about it. If we look at pictures of children of that period, in their grown-up clothes, and their likewise grown-up toys, there is a rather un-childlike appearance about them. There are examples of precocious productivity (Pascal, Leibnitz, Grotius), which do not occur any more today. If we look at the literature that was given to children in those days, we are inclined to presume that not a few were capable of very precocious achievements. Montaigne advises that philosophical dialogues should be read aloud to children as soon as they are weaned. It cannot be true that all this conceited adult literature was exclusively due to an enormous misunderstanding of what a child can grasp or not grasp. We rather get the impression that at an early date, and without much conflict, the child dropped, so to say, into a precocious adulthood. We have reason to accept the view that in former times the child reached adulthood at an earlier period in his life. In his book on pre-adolescence (*Flegeljahre*, 1950), a study of the historically changing picture of youth and adulthood, H.H. Muchow notes that a psychic coming of age, just as the preceding period of pre-adolescence, was missing in human life in earlier periods of history. With the increase of complications in social structure, however, the length of childhood and of adolescence increase also.

Since Rousseau, and even more since the French Revolution, Western society has been losing more and more of its uniformity. It cannot be by chance that Rousseau was one of the first who wrote about adolescence in such a way that we can recognize our youth in his picture of it. The form of coming of age which he describes was most probably the answer of his time to the loss of social uniformity. Since that period the process continues. About 1800 pre-adolescence comes into being.<sup>1</sup> About 1900, when a genuine spiritual revolution overthrew most of the existing norms and principles, adolescence was characterized by singular depth and a long duration, which explains why precisely at that period the first monographs about puberty were written (G. St. Hall, 1904; Mendouse, 1909). Later decades show us, however, that coming of age does not finish at the end of puberty,

<sup>1</sup> MUCHOW, *Op. cit.*

but continues far into the next years (first adulthood), which causes people in certain classes of society — at least in Western Europe — not to be adults before they are twenty-five.

The child of today cannot grow up in a hurry; it should remain a child during a long period of relative awareness before it comes to tackle the confusion of a complicated adulthood. Is it amazing that some folk never reach that stage? Can it be wondered at that a great number do not reach this stage quite successfully with complete adaptation or, in other words, in a more or less neurotic way? And is our expectation not justified that a great many people who have reached adulthood now and again do get into trouble? It is the modern form of adult social life that causes the psychotherapist's constant lack of time for those that seek his help, and the pastor's diary to resemble the dentist's appointment book.

To the question put in the beginning of this article we can now answer: psychotherapy and pastoral care are so important in the present day because our social life has become an excellent fertilizer for all kinds of personal difficulties.

The second question that arose was: *Why do psychotherapy and pastoral care lie so close to one another that we have difficulty in distinguishing them?*

Not long ago they could be distinguished. I quoted the definition Asmussen gave of pastoral care (1933). According to his definition, pastoral care means a message from the Gospel to the individual, a sermon beside the pulpit. Nothing else can be pastoral care. Psychotherapy cannot be pastoral care, because psychotherapy has nothing whatever in common with a sermon. The distinction was clear-cut. The practical consequence of this conception was significant. It meant that the pastor who did practise inter-personal conversation without directly mentioning the Gospel would realize that he did not practise pastoral care. Conversation consists namely in a give and take; it moves within the realm of human relativities; pastoral care however knew only the principle of the objective message of judgment and redemption. No compromises were to be made as to this objective norm; no compromises either, in those days, with regard to other then existing norms, numerous as they were in personal and social life. In general one



norm was valid for most things, a norm one had better respect if one did not want to meet serious difficulties. Divorce for instance was considered an impossibility. Any form of sexual contact between betrothed persons was thought unacceptable. Opposition of the child to its parents was to be condemned in any form. The right of a voice in industry for the employee was unimaginable. Conscientious objection was simply a crime, that could only be punished. Compared with our time, there was then hardly any interest for the motives of a personal act which did not tally with the ruling principles. Society respected — within certain limits — one norm for most things, and everybody was expected to conform to it. In the same way today on the island of Samoa it is taken for granted that everybody lives as everybody else does, and in the way their ancestors have lived as far back as human memory goes.

### *A change in social norms*

All this happened to change in the 20th century. Conscientious objection is no longer called a crime ; in most Western countries there exists a tendency to listen to the motives that lead to objection ; certain motives are recognized as legitimate, and in that case the objector is not punished. Acknowledgment of the right of the employee to a voice in industry is generally considered as desirable, and ways are looked for by which this right can be exercised without its overturning authority — the former norm — so that labour would suffer. The opposition of the child is accepted in certain circumstances ; it is even found necessary, where the child, in order to attain adulthood, should have to free itself from a too strong parental tie ; and parents are quite frequently found who are persuaded without difficulty that opposition to them can in some cases be legitimate and desirable. As to sexual contact during engagement, it is realized in wide circles today that a total rejection of this contact is a denial of reality. Now that marriage is no longer a status of life whose structure is a dictate of society, but a creation of a human couple, it is more and more understood that young people should prepare themselves for marriage in a personal rather than in an impersonal generalized way : it is recognized that

to some betrothed persons one or another form of sexual acquaintance is a better preparation for marriage than no such form of acquaintance. This view does not compromise morals. On the contrary, morality is rather damaged by a *judicium* that does not correspond in our days to reality as it is earnestly and responsibly lived up to.

By taking seriously this reality, by asking oneself for instance what engagement to be married means *today* for this particular couple, which admits the desirability of sexual acquaintance, we increase the sense of responsible decision which the partners should have with regard to each other. It is for the same reason that we cannot in every case condemn divorce. The old norm has lost its sanction ; the simple answer does not satisfy any more ; it has become insincere. Everywhere there is the same need for an answer that takes into account the situation in which that answer must be given. The tendency of modern ethics therefore is to become more and more a situational ethics, which does not mean of course that it should exclusively spring from vital situations as they present themselves, but certainly that by its pronouncements ethics should not cease to reckon with the situation from which the question arose and in which the answer will have to function. And this applies even more forcibly to ethics where it is the expression of faith. Because faith today does not only or primarily consist in the acceptance of a body of doctrines or beliefs, nor in a word-for-word confession, but in a way of life, of meeting with things and people and with ourselves. Every time has its own forms of faith and unbelief. One can understand that in a time when norms were supposed to be compelling evidence to everybody, faith had to be chiefly an acceptance of definite norms. Today this seems insufficient. Churchgoing, prayer, Scripture reading, taking of the sacraments, as facts taken by themselves do not seem to prove very much, as they did in former days. Is not the *way* in which these things are done essential ? And once we realize that the way things are done matters, should this not apply to all our doings ? More than was the case a century ago, faith is today a matter of practical living. If faith is something else besides — and I do believe it is something else besides — then this “else besides” becomes

only real to people of our days if it manifests itself in our daily life. Faith now manifests itself in the *way* we deal with things and with our fellow men.

### *Faith and life*

The distance between faith and life has become smaller. The first result of this change is that faith has become more real. Faith today, as compared to the past century, is less exclusively individualistic and to our modern minds a less sterile relation with God, separated as it was from all other relationships that exist: the relationship to our work, with the family, etc. Faith, we are nowadays inclined to say, should be expressed precisely in these various relationships: in the way man does his work, in the way he is married, the way in which he educates his children, and meets his friends and his foes. I am sure that this comprehension of faith has always existed in one way or another, but it is far more emphasized in recent times.

The second result is that our daily life has gained in importance. More than before we want to know *how* it is lived and what significance we should give to events. We are no longer satisfied with some pronouncement or a mere act: we want to know their motivation. We want to know why and how such and such a judgment took its origin in a sort of existence which through the polyvalent character of our society is lived differently by almost everyone. The employer is not content to know that his men work: he wants to know in what spirit they work; he engages a social worker who moves about in fields that do not directly concern the work, but indirectly do so all the more. It is this same increase of the importance of daily life that makes a lopsided announcement of the Gospel, as Asmussen understood it, insufficient for the pastor who practises pastoral care. For where does he find a guarantee that his message of the Word is indeed a message of the *Word*? In a monovalent society it is quite probable that such a guarantee exists; but today the pastor has to find out whether the word he is going to speak can in fact be received. Though he may be quite convinced that faith is a question of grace, he

cannot deny that insuperable obstacles may block the way to this grace or, if this is not the case, that grace at any rate should always be received and digested in a personal fashion. The reception and digestion depend largely on how the pastor speaks. He talks with people, he shows who he himself is, he gets acquainted with men's lives. He discovers immaturities, he suspects neurotic obstacles and goes on talking. He talks till he thinks the time is ripe to pronounce explicitly the Word which during the whole conversation was tacitly implied.

### *Psychotherapy and pastoral care*

Pastoral conversation knows two phases: the implicit and the explicit announcement of the Word. It may be clear now that it is not correct to call the first phase the preparation of the second. In both the same thing happens, although in a different manner. Not infrequently the first phase suffices. In that case the outsider gets the impression that the pastor does the job of a good friend, a social worker or a psychotherapist. Do we still wonder at the difficulty of having to distinguish between pastoral conversation and ordinary, everyday help: between pastoral care and education, assistance, therapy?

We might ask ourselves if that distinction becomes clear perhaps if we take psychotherapy as a starting point. But the curious thing is that here again we are faced with the same difficulty that the pastor had to meet. In the course of the last years the interpretation of psychotherapy has undergone a change, with the result that here also the distinction from pastoral care seems to have been wiped out. According to Freud, neurosis consists in a conflict between two realms of the soul: conscience (the I) and the unconscious life of the instinctive urges (the Id).

It used to be the psychotherapist's job to reconcile these two hostile realms. Considering the fact, however, that nearly always the patient implicitly involved the therapist in the struggle between the two realms, that in other words contact with the psychotherapist appeared to be of the first importance to the patient, doubt arose as to the soundness of the original definition of neurosis. Nowadays authors like Karen Horney, for instance, understand neurosis to be a disturbance in "con-



tactibility": not in the sense of a disturbance in the possibility of contact between the two realms of the individual soul, but in the sense of a disturbance in contact with the patient's environment and particularly with the people of his environment. Where neurosis is defined as an inter-psychic conflict, psychotherapy is easily distinguished from pastoral care: for then psychotherapy means the restoration of harmony between I and Id, a strictly individual change; pastoral care however means the restoration of harmony between God and man, and aims at a change that is pre-eminently communicative. When neurosis, however, is defined as a disturbance of contact or communication with one's fellow men, then this distinction does not hold much longer. Psychotherapy must then be seen as the effort to re-establish harmony between the patient and others, aiming, like pastoral care, at a communicative change. It might be observed that still there would remain an important difference, for is not there an essentially different contact at stake in these two forms of care? But have we the right to ask that question? Does the New Testament not repeatedly warn us with regard to such an absolute distinction? Is not contact with our fellow man a constant singularization of our contact with God? Be that as it may, we are astonished if successful psychotherapy results in a better contact with God. And what in this case has the psychotherapist been doing? Pastoral care or psychotherapy? It is not easy to say. Again we find ourselves faced with the almost impossible task of distinguishing between these two forms of care.

The answer to the second question that was put at the beginning of this article I will now summarize as follows. The fact that psychotherapy and pastoral care, both as definition and practice, are so hard to separate is caused by a change of interpretation of the pastor's as well as of the psychotherapist's work.

It should not be difficult now to answer briefly the next two questions. The first question was, *How is Christian pastoral care different from psychotherapeutical care, and to what extent do they overlap?*

I shall start with the last part of this question. Both psychotherapy and pastoral care aim today at a restoration of com-

municative contact. Even when we interpret the word "communication" in the exclusive sense of relation between one human being and another, we must realize that this relation involves much more than what we, humanly speaking, can know about it. We are indeed justified in saying that this relation is always representing another relation, which we may call a relation of faith. Therefore psychotherapy and pastoral care overlap in a very general sense. It is not by chance that psychotherapy came to its bloom in a Christianized culture. We have no right to doubt that the evangelical mission can be carried out through psychotherapy in whatever form it may take. Psychotherapeutical practice in its deepest sense means redress of the relation of faith, that is, pastoral care. The pastor, on the other hand, is compelled to practise purely inter-personal care and that not in the sense of preparatory work for something quite different; no indeed, he is inclined to measure the realized inter-personal relation in terms of the realized relation of his client's faith, and so exercises his purely inter-personal work without a bad conscience. That is to say he goes at it wholeheartedly, certain that this is the work he has got in the first place to do.

This answer may seem pretty abstract or theoretical. I agree: there are so many practical differences between pastoral care and psychotherapy that what I say would be incomplete if I stopped at the previous remarks. So I will now summarize these differences in three points.

1. However deeply the modern pastor may be aware of the fact that his work should be carried out within the framework of inter-personal contact, in the form of simple advice or conversation, he nevertheless does not forget for one moment that his contact's background is the Gospel. While listening to his client he listens to God's voice through those words, and he hopes that through his own words God may speak to the other. However important the inter-personal contact may seem to be, he can never be satisfied with its secular aspect. The psychotherapist, even if personally he is quite convinced that the relationship with God determines all other relationships, will not bring this subject into his therapy. It would be a medical or clinical-psychological mistake if he did so. The client has

come to him hoping to recover his medico-psychological health. If sometimes this seems to have happened, but still the client does not feel himself in the right condition, then his doctor may send him to the pastor ; sometimes he can try to help him himself, but then he ceases to be a psychotherapist and becomes a pastor. The following comparison may clarify this : the patient who goes to the surgeon with a broken leg wishes his leg to be mended. Although everyone, the surgeon as well as the patient, knows that whole legs can carry their proprietor to his fortune or his ruin as well as broken ones, it would be medically improper if at the end of the treatment the surgeon asked his patient what he was planning to do now with his whole legs. Only if the patient consults him on that point too can the surgeon go into that matter with him. Or the surgeon may direct him to the psychotherapist or the pastor.

The same is true in the case of psychotherapy : just as it is clear to everybody that the capacity for a sound inter-personal relationship can lead to good as well as to evil, the psychotherapist has no medical justification in asking what his client is now going to do with his restored capacity to make contacts. If the patient asks this himself, then the doctor can continue with advice, but he works no longer as a psychotherapist, but as a pastor. The psychiatrist — or the clinical psychologist — never pushes further than the patient expressly or tacitly induces him to do ; he is the servant of the patient and this service the patient recognizes by paying his fee.

The pastor, on the contrary, is the servant of another Master who commands him to work and to continue to work even if it does not suit his own wishes or those of the other person. And since it is this Master's work that is vicariously done by the pastor, he does not require a fee.

Of course the psychotherapist, whether he admits it or not, obeys the same Master, but in his case the obedience requires that His Word remains hidden, is kept implicit. Not because of shortsightedness or fear, but for the sake of the medical task that must be practised.

2. The second difference between the work of the pastor and the psychotherapist lies in the fact that the psychotherapist deals with disturbed people, whereas the pastor finds his work

also among all those who, far from being disturbed, feel healthy, adapted and happy. This fact seems to be almost overlooked in our days. The reason for this seems obvious: the percentage of those that have to contend with difficulties of all kinds is so large that we are inclined to forget that after all there exists still a considerable percentage of undisturbed people. The pastor's sphere of action is larger than the psychotherapist's. Where the latter would find nothing to do, the pastor's task seems clear to him. It may even be true that he sees his task clearest where the psychotherapist is completely satisfied. For is not a sound, adapted and happy life often characterized by absence of faith? Perhaps unbelief may be called the best guarantee of complete health, medically speaking. Pastor and therapist have a different notion of health. It is possible that the therapist sees before him a long and laborious task, where the pastor sees no reason for alarm. We have already established that the inter-personal relationship is an expression of the relationship of faith, which allows and even requires of him to practise in the inter-personal field. But once more we must point out that recovery of normal human contact can never be the final stage for the pastor. If the essential character of the contact is not realized, the pastor cannot be satisfied. The therapist can be.

3. I said a moment ago that the pastor's field is larger than the therapist's, whereas the psychotherapist commands a field into which the pastor has no entry and where he should not come if he wants to execute his pastoral task effectively. I am now alluding to the seriously disturbed neurotics, whose problems are so predominantly medical that the pastor can merely realize that for him there is (as yet) nothing to do, the serious nature of the disturbance forbidding him to deal with questions of faith or lack of faith. For these neurotics are not able to consider any question related to faith or unbelief. The only pastoral task in that case must be to send the person to the therapist, thus executing, to my mind, an eminently pastoral act.

This remark brings us right away to the answering of the last question: *What knowledge of psychotherapy (and of the theory of neurotic disturbances, for these two are indissolubly related) should a person have who is concerned with carrying out Christian pastoral work?*



The first answer to this, immediately following from the above, runs as follows: the pastor should know as much about neurotic disturbances as he needs in order to see clearly where his task stops or does (not yet) begin, taking into account the serious character of the other's neurotic disturbances. But this does not mean that he should know the nature of the treatment that this particular neurotic disturbance requires. Or rather: he should know as much about it as he likes, and it is doubtless a good thing that he should know a lot about it, but it is essential that he should abstain from any medical treatment. He should not practice any psychoanalysis, any non-directive therapy, *rêve éveillé*, etc., any of those specific therapies which would make of him a therapist and put an end to his pastoral care. Psychotherapy in its limited sense is an exclusively medical matter requiring a very special training and an experience of many years. The pastor lacks this training and this experience; it is not advisable for him to obtain them.

The pastor however should be initiated into psychotherapy as a way of approach to people not exactly disturbed but struggling with difficulties. It is necessary that he should master the technique of the really difficult conversation. For it is due to the way Western man lives today that the pastor cannot confine himself to a simple preaching of the Gospel.

The pastor enters into the world of those surrounding him, the world of their private present existence, from the midst of which the Word that finally keeps each human being alive meets him in an ever different, ever new fashion. This Word catches his ear and he passes it on. This is the conversation he is carrying on, and during this conversation with men he must not make any mistake.

## THE STUDENT WORLD CHRONICLE

### **The Chalet in Finland**

*The Federation Chalet, which was held in Finland during August, 1953, had as its theme "Pastoral Care". Here are the impressions of two student members of it, and a summary of the discussion which took place on "student needs".*

#### I

The most important thing I expected from the Chalet was to get new ideas, which could help us in solving the many problems we have in our S.C.M. work.

There have always been different opinions of the position of the S.C.M. in the universities, and of its right to existence. I have met pastors who accuse it of neglecting the Church, of having some kind of highly intellectual religiousness of its own, etc. The Chalet opened for us a clear way in this matter. The introduction on "student needs" from the point of view of students from several universities in different countries already pointed out how unique and varied students' problems are. It showed us, too, that though the Church should be familiar with men generally, this is not enough in our day, when it is a question of student life. The Church has remained an outsider. The students themselves know their own problems and those of their fellow students, and they are able to help each other. This does not supplant the Church: on the contrary. The sacraments and services keep us connected with the Church. But it is good to know clearly that the student's task in the work of the Church is primarily in the S.C.M. Not until after leaving it is he or she free to take part in the ordinary work of the Church. In Christian work among students we are like isolated pioneers, but in the background there stands the whole Church. Thus the S.C.M. ought to be some kind of attacking breast-work, if I am allowed to use so military a term.

I am glad that at the Chalet we discussed the problem of the character of the S.C.M. At our small university we always have the danger of the S.C.M. being a cosy family circle, where it is nice to come together. We run the risk of being too close a circle where non-members dare not come. We try to keep the façade clean, even

if there is something wrong inside. We know quite well that pitiful type of S.C.M. member who, after finishing his or her studies and going to a province, absolutely gives up being an active Christian. But the task of the S.C.M. is just to prepare us for life. If we, as students, made sure about the right way to live and a firm faith, how fruitful our life could be. Therefore the S.C.M. has above all to be an open community, though it is not to be undervalued as a family circle either. It ought to be a community where its members together receive strength in communion with Christ. And this strength we need to find in intercourse with non-S.C.M. members as well as among ourselves.

We Finns are shy of revealing our inner feelings, particularly religious ones. Therefore it is natural that the students at our small university are afraid of becoming stamped as Christians (of course they all are baptized and belong to the Lutheran Church but that does not mean that they have a personal belief). We have quite a lot of students who go to church but, for fear of becoming marked, they dare not come to S.C.M. meetings. In this respect the S.C.M. can do incalculably much, both by being an open community and particularly by the individual work of its members. Especially for this individual work, pastoral care, the main theme of the Chalet, gave us plenty of help, even as to practical methods.

It was something quite new that the main stress in pastoral care was put on taking care of man as a whole, not only of his soul. There again we met with our Finnish besetting sin: we are too religious and pious, we regard everything that is secular as being a minor point. "Pastoral care is simply the opening of the channel of the healing water which flows through the centuries from God." The idea of this sentence, said by Francis House, is most important. If God cannot use us people as tools, how does He work in this world? Pastoral care is the only way to show love and carry out the commandments of God. Therefore it is of the greatest value. We cannot deny that we treat our non-Christian fellow students with a certain prejudice. We ourselves are the first to build up barriers round our S.C.M. But this is against the idea of pastoral care.

For several years, perhaps through all the existence of the S.C.M., we have struggled with the problem whether we are allowed or not, and to what extent, to take part in the life of the whole student body. This may seem strange to those who do not know the character of Finnish religiousness. It seems to have claimed to itself a place in the absolutely religious life, nothing secular at all being allowed in. Nevertheless, in our S.C.M. we chose the way of taking part in the life of the student body and its activities according to

our possibilities. I am glad that we were on the path that the Chalet recommended to us. And here we have the opportunity to carry out pastoral care. Therefore the theme of this Chalet was most valuable, particularly from the point of view of our S.C.M.

In our days young people feel uncertain and have numerous problems. It has been said that they live in a foggy world. Often it may be difficult to know what is right and what is wrong, much less to act rightly. Here a field of individual work is opened to a Christian student. If he or she knows where to find hope and why to live and where to get strength, of course he or she will speak about this. The lecture given by Peter Kreyssig, on the theme "Caring for Each Other in the University Community" was an excellent contribution to our thinking about the tasks and difficulties in this work.

From this point of view the discussion groups at the Chalet were useful. Themes like "Communication", "The Student as a Member of Communities", "What is the Good News?" etc., promised direct answers to the questions that arise in intercourse with non-S.C.M. members. To find a language in which we should be understood among non-S.C.M. members means that we have to go to them where they are, put ourselves in the matters they are interested in and help them in everyday life.

As to the Bible study at the Chalet, not until then did we come to the question of what is law and Pharisaism in our religion at this very moment. No doubt this question is important, especially to us Finns. Some religious traditions in our country often rouse the suspicion whether they are only forms of law. We have been educated and are used to the idea that there are things allowed to us, but still more that are not. No wonder that on the level of the university these questions may appear in a new light and perhaps become stumbling-blocks to some. It is good to stop to think and to try to make clear what is merely performing the law, and is therefore Pharisaism, and which of the traditions could be thrown away. This Pharisaism is dangerous among students. It is a bad service to Christ. We have already discussed such themes as "The Traditions of our Fathers — are they Pharisaism?", "Have we to obey all authorities?" etc.

On the last day at the Chalet Kyaw Than said that the letter to the Galatians was no longer the same to him as it was before. I should say that the whole message of the Bible has become more familiar after Bible study at the Chalet. We are so accustomed to the language of the Bible that we don't come to think that it may be "language of Canaan" to others, and perhaps to ourselves,



without our discovering it. Thus the way of translating the Bible into modern language gave an amazing result.]

The problems arising in Christian student work may be easy to solve, but it is by no means easy to see them. Therefore it was good to have an opportunity to observe one's own S.C.M. from the outside, in the light of the Chalet. For example, the main problem of our S.C.M. was where to get inner strength in work that had outward strength because it was done in favourable circumstances. The answer that we perhaps were unwilling to admit was simply prayer. The most impressive lecture at the Chalet was given on this subject.

I am specially glad that at the Chalet there were participants from so many countries formerly enemies with each other. It is of great importance that we are able to cross the gulf created by the war and to meet each other without bitterness and hatred. It gives concrete evidence of forgiveness in great conflicts too.

But above all the immense feeling for Christian unity throughout the world filled one's heart with joy. I am glad that we got this international Chalet in our own country. One more reason is because this kind of meeting bears in itself evidence of the reality of the Ecumenical Movement. We know that each age creates its own religious movements. Our awakening movements have been and will be a great blessing to our people. But by the side of them there is arising a new movement, the Ecumenical Movement. Only an international view is able to open our eyes also to ecumenical questions in our own country. Though we cannot speak about a great ecumenical problem, we meet this in everyday life. Such camps as the Chalet give faith in the Ecumenical Movement and open new views of the one, Holy, Catholic Church of Christ.

AILI RYTKONEN.

## II

One of the questions that we discussed during the last days of the Study Chalet was : how can we make the results of the Chalet fruitful for our fellow students ? Perhaps the answer to this question is as simple and as difficult as many other problems were : "Be ye doers of the Word and not hearers only."

It is not my intention to give correct quotations of the lectures and the discussions. It would be impossible, because the Chalet was much more than a series of lectures and discussions : it was a lively illustration of the theme. We did not only discuss pastoral care, but it was also carried out.

In our worship and in our discussions we felt the tension between the unity and the disunion of the Church. In this situation we read St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians and we listened to the apostle speaking to and caring for that young, small church in its critical situation. The disastrous French strike was not only an interesting subject to talk about, but it made us feel Europe's ideological disintegration. Teiniharju seemed to be the contrary : a wonderful silence reigned in the lakes and the quiet woods. If there had been nothing else but that heavenly scenery, Teiniharju would have been only a peaceful holiday resort for them who have had enough of the chaotic world, but there were hymns and prayers for that peace which the world cannot give.

We heard a lot about many difficulties in numerous universities. We felt : to solve these problems is too heavy a task for us. We also knew of each other that we had not come to Teiniharju to show our pastoral knowledge, but that we came to listen to the Gospel of the Great Shepherd. The Gospel does not give a solution to every problem created by our disordered situation. It criticizes that situation and those problems. It shows us the origin of our confusion. "Our pastoral needs as students" cannot be our starting point, for in that case our best result would be an analysis of our disintegration.

### *Christ our starting point.*

The lines our thoughts followed originated in the Cross. At Golgotha Christ conquered the cause of our disintegration. By thinking about this, the relationship between sin and illness also became evident to us. By illness is meant here : loneliness, broken relationships, hopelessness. Christ's proclamation of the Gospel and His healing is our task. Healing only takes place on the road that leads to the Cross. Forgiveness of sin gives communication and fellowship.

We may be fellow workers in this, His work. The Gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven may indeed come to everybody individually, but it is conveyed by men. They who have listened to the Gospel live next to and together with others.

The function of the S.C.M. already became somewhat clear in the discussion about the theological and biblical basis of pastoral care. The S.C.M. as a community takes part in the problems of the student and the S.C.M. puts new questions.

The S.C.M. may not claim to know the solution to every question that is put in university life, because the Gospel often does not accept our way of putting a question. The Gospel shows us the

problems and does not start with the problems that we have discovered and felt ourselves.

### *What is pastoral care ?*

In the course of the Study Chalet it appeared that there were many differences of opinion about what is meant by pastoral care. Some participants were of the opinion that pastoral care belongs to the work of a specially trained person, i. e. an ordained minister of the Church. It was frequently stressed that pastoral care is an aspect of the priesthood of all believers; it means caring for each other in the Christian community, bearing the burden of another. Others defined pastoral care as caring for our fellow men in the world, acting as a custodian for people in the world whether they know Jesus Christ or not.

We felt that there was a close connection between our conception of the Church and its ministry and our understanding of pastoral care. Another reason for this divergency was the uneasiness about both the lack of witnessing power and the lack of community in the S.C.M. I think most of us could agree with the statement that pastoral care is the work of Jesus Christ in His Church and that it is mediated through the Church.

If we have the right understanding of God's purpose with the Church, we ought not to lose sight of the world. The Church exists for those who are not its members. As soon as the Church concentrates on itself, it is cut off from God as its source and its real purpose.

The Report of the Nasrapur Commission on "Our pastoral needs as students" seemed to have a lack of understanding of the Church and its role in the work of pastoral care. In the discussions during the Study Chalet we many times faced the problem of the nature of the Church and its ministry. I am convinced that these questions are in urgent need of a profound theological discussion on an ecumenical basis.

On the other hand the relation between pastoral care and psychotherapy also calls for our attention, and perhaps the Study Chalet did not study this subject enough.

### *Is the S.C.M. able to carry out pastoral care ?*

In the beginning of the Chalet the situation in many S.C.M.s was characterized as follows: the first Federation generation was very clear in speaking to individuals, but nowadays our members are not prepared to speak personally with non-Christian students. The S.C.M. is mostly not witnessing, nor is it a community.

In the study group in which I took part we discussed especially how Christian students can strengthen each other's faith. It is not a purpose in itself, but it is on behalf of the world that we have to strengthen the faith of our fellow S.C.M. members.

Very often we take the doctrinal knowledge and the devotional life of S.C.M. members for granted. Especially on the point of the inner life we have to take care of our fellow members. We need a biblical theology, a comprehensive presentation of the Christian faith and a better understanding of the fact that we are part of a total community. We must help each other within the S.C.M. in a practical way: we must help our fellow members in their prayer life and their private Bible reading, especially when we feel weak. We must accept their help in our spiritual life especially when we feel strong. Frequently we do not allow our brother to interfere in our inner life and we do not accept the criticism of the Gospel. The life of the Chalet gave me the experience that the S.C.M. can be a community, because these things did not remain a purely theoretical matter.

We heard Christ's commandment: "Be perfect." That means: renewal of ourselves, rededication to the Lord. That involves a certain discipline of life. We saw that we need a coherent view of life, a statement of priorities. Very often we do not make our Christian belief relevant in the "secular sector" of our lives as students. We found that reintegration means that the Gospel has something to do with our use of time and spending money, with our study and our loyalties to different communities inside and outside the university.

When I went home from Teiniharju I had a lot of things to think about. Many difficult theological questions were raised, many problems remained unsolved. The things which had become clear were "the obvious", but they were the most important!

To summarize the Study Chalet on pastoral care: we heard Christ, the Great Shepherd, speaking to each of us individually and to the whole world: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

KLAAS BISSCHOP.

### III

Christians have an uncomfortable, and not always justifiable habit of beginning their utterances with sweeping statements about the misery of the world! To outsiders it often looks as though, when they begin to talk, they have first to "create" a need in order to show how conclusively the Christian faith can meet it. At the



Chalet we were, I think, aware from the beginning of this danger, and even more were we conscious of the fact that, to use the words of Dr. Visser't Hooft, "Christ came into the world not to answer our questions, but to ask of us all a fundamental question." We come with our needs to Christ, yes. And, in His name, we go to others in their need. But we have to remember as we do it that the needs we see on the surface, and which they feel, are not always their most fundamental needs, and that there are many situations where the Christian need not blush when he draws attention to a need which is not apparent; it may in fact be a more important one than those which get into textbooks of psychology, sociology and economics. When Christ healed the woman who came to Him in the crowd and touched His garment, He was not content to let her go away healed, her felt need met. He called her out of the crowd, asked her to identify herself before Him, and only then (though the healing had already taken place) said to her, "Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole, go in peace."

Pastoral care is not concerned simply with remedial activity. It is creative, and in its full development, creative of faith: it is the activity of the Church as its most complete.

\* \* \*

I am sure that it is emphatically in that framework that the members of the Chalet would like me to record something of what they said by way of report on "student needs" in their various countries.

Let us realize at once too that when we talk about "student needs" we talk about the needs of the members of the S.C.M. The S.C.M. is not insulated — or shouldn't be — against the shocks of modern university life, and its members share in the resulting strains. This is, indeed, one of our main problems: as one of our Finns put it, "We're expected not to have any worries." Inner buoyancy and serenity is one of the gifts of the Holy Spirit.

We were, first of all, a very varied group. Eleven countries were represented and there was much in each student situation which the others did not share. In some, the presence of physical needs — housing, books, clothing, food — was as difficult a problem as their absence in others! Our Swiss and North American delegates made much of this. There was a great variation of the situation of students *vis-à-vis* their families; some (as in Finland) came in large measure from peasant homes, where entrance into a university inevitably caused a rupture on many levels, even if the student

remained a contented member of his family. Some (in Australia) lived largely in their parents' homes, while others (Germany, France) moved out of the community in which they had been born when they went to the university. Asian students were younger than European students, but their society was in a more rapid process of change than Europe's, which meant that still more was demanded of them in the way of maturity and adjustment.

In some countries (Burma) there were ethnic tensions on the campus, even in the S.C.M. In some (the South of the United States) there was a high proportion of nominal Christians, while in others, to be a member of a Christian group was to be a "marked man".

Along with these differences however there went a surprising number of similarities. There are, in fact, any number of points at which the members of the Federation can help one another.

One set of problems arose in connection with the communities of which the student is a member. First, he is, as a student, a member of the society, the national group, into which he has been born. His very studying is the function which he is called to perform responsibly within it. But in many countries the student is coming less and less to feel his significance *as a student* and, in that capacity, as responsible member of the community. The presence or absence of state scholarships seem to have little to do with this.

This problem takes on insidious forms in Eastern Germany, where the government attempts to buy the student's allegiance by generous scholarships. But it buys him not as a student, a man with an open and critical mind, but as a follower of Marxist principles. In the United States students tend to refrain from political activity out of fear of the effect it may have later on their advancement in a career. An American student worker said, "We have no heroes, no crusaders. We are *in* society, but do not feel ourselves responsible for it. We leave it to John Doe!" Nationalism, once strong amongst Finnish students, has declined with their general sense of purpose. The "ivory tower" of study divorced from life thus becomes a reality; or else students may absorb themselves in the often false excitements of university or college life, creating them where they do not exist. They dodge questions of vocation, postpone thought of the future, and soon the loss of a personal goal creates an aimlessness which affects even their study. In Texas one of the most admired figures on the campus is the "casual kid", the popular, practical man, who knows that it is not "smart" to be intellectual, and studies, if at all, discreetly!

If we now look at the student as a member of the community of the family, similar problems exist. As in society, he is no longer

"at home". In very many cases entrance into the university means entrance into a new social milieu ; the cases where some adjustment has not to be made are few. An Australian said that many families regard study strictly as a means to an end (a good job), and that respect for the student calling as such is not encouraged at home. In Germany, a frighteningly high percentage of students come from fatherless or broken homes, and in the latter case their loneliness is equalled by their suspicion of all forms of community life. If such situations are not simply to end in sterile rebellion and estrangement, something must be done to help students to understand their plight for what it is, to stand the strains involved, and to develop in them patience, and the grace which leads to reconciliation.

Insofar as students are imminently family-builders themselves (some already are), the relation between men and women on the campus belongs to this general theme. In almost every country this exists as a problem. It assumes a painful form in Asia, where rapidly changing patterns of man-woman relationships make the choice of alternatives for behaviour wider, and therefore more difficult. But everywhere there exists the thirst for basic information, as well as the desire for answer to burning moral problems. When asked to state their preference for the theme of a series of talks, seventy per cent of women on an American campus chose this subject. Is this a point where the Federation could help ?

The questions related to the student as a member of the university community are already well known to those who have followed the development of the university concern in the Federation in recent years. The lack of personal relations between staff and students, the weakness of the "community of study", the individualism encouraged by the examination system, are all familiar themes.

The cry of "loneliness" came again and again, and with it demands for the sort of community the S.C.M. should be to meet this need, and to provide a place where people could "really talk to one another". The search for community takes abortive forms : often that of simply "joining something". In one university in Texas there are more than 250 student organizations, and every student belongs to several. Their existence in itself is not a bad thing, but the way in which they are often used is not likely to have really fruitful results in the lives of the students concerned. Loneliness also leads to a misuse of the sex relationship, which ends by destroying that relationship's unique quality and possibilities. False forms of community are thus sought with little success, and all too often the S.C.M. itself is contented with providing little more than the sort of superficial fellowship produced by any other organization, and by-passing its pastoral

task. It has to *show*, as well as to say, that the student does not solve his problem of loneliness by joining something, but that factors like sin, redemption and the gifts of the Holy Spirit are practical realities, the recognition of which is a condition of the creation of a true as well as a satisfying human community. The problems which confront the S.C.M. in the realm of community thus look indeed, on paper, almost insoluble. It has to be both a centre of Christian fellowship and an open community; a centre of evangelism at the same time as it fulfils the function described by someone who today is an eminent Christian professor in England, when she said, "The S.C.M. held me and trusted me when I could not believe."

All over the world the confusion caused by lack of time, by too many things to keep up with, both curricular and extra-curricular, looms large. The apathy about which complaints are made, the search for authority rather than truth, are often results not of laziness, but exhaustion. There is too little time for recollection, and those who accept responsibilities in the S.C.M. feel this as much as anyone. They are often called upon to display a maturity of thought and character which they have simply not had time to develop. Very frequently they lack a basic theological background and do not know how to set about systematically acquiring it. In all this there is a need for guidance and help, to show students the way through the distracting complications of their existence. They need mature assistance which will ease the burden at the same time as it helps them to bear it, and to use their forces to the maximum in confronting their tasks of thinking and acting. The creation in its own midst of the "strong Christian individuals" about which Peter Kreyssig talks in his article becomes a primary responsibility of the S.C.M. In the present situation we cannot restrict ourselves to ministering to our members' minds alone, and hoping that the desired results will follow. The search for authority has been mentioned. We cannot discard it as unworthy of a student outlook. People want to be able to judge what is right and wrong; to take up political positions; to find a real vocation; to believe or disbelieve; to confess their sins and know that they are forgiven. Aili Rytkonen says, "Young people live in a foggy world." Where does authority come into the relative freedom of the S.C.M. approach? If there is bound to be an element of authority in the work of the pastor (as the New Testament suggests), in what sense can pastoral care be given in the S.C.M.? How is it, in this realm, related to the Church?

An account of the discussion is bound to end with questions, because we did end with questions. Even while we were willing to admit the slogan "back to the obvious" coined during the Chalet,



we still had the question of how in a practical way an S.C.M. program could be adjusted in order to get back to the obvious, even the question of how we are to keep our eyes open so as to see what is obvious. Our attempt to keep student needs in their proper perspective should not blind us to the fact that too often our ghetto existence prevents us from seeing them at all.

The basic question with which our survey of needs left us is well stated in a paragraph from one of David Read's Warrack Lectures (*The Communication of the Gospel*, pp. 43-44) :

"It seems to me that the vital challenge of the Christian Church that emerges from the pressures of our revolutionary era concerns above all the reality and relevance of the Gospel. We are not faced with a generation of intellectual sceptics, or even of consistent materialists, but with bewildered, distracted, uncertain men and women, conditioned to respond to scientific demonstrations, suspicious of obvious propaganda, and unable to see much meaning in our religious propositions. Many of us will have had the experience of explaining the meaning of the Christian Creed to an enquirer, only to be met at the end with the plaintive remark : 'Yes, I can accept it all with my mind ; but it doesn't mean anything to me ; it's not real!'"

The question is, how shall we so understand the needs of students as to make the Gospel real to them ?

LEILA GILES.

## BOOK REVIEWS

COMMUNISM AND THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN INDIA, Ed. P. D. Devanandan and M. M. Thomas. Y.M.C.A. Publishing House, Calcutta. 1 rupee (about 1 Swiss franc).

We have grown accustomed, within the Federation, to reading and talking about the social revolution in Asia. It was defined for us in the Grey Book on *The Christian in the World Struggle*, under the inspiration of an Asian — M. M. Thomas. Now we have a Christian interpretation of the situation in a crucially important Asian country — *Communism and the Social Revolution in India*. This is a cooperative effort by James P. Alter, C. Arangadan, J. Russell Chandran, P. D. Devanandan, Leonard Schiff and M. M. Thomas, who spent a month together meditating on and discussing previously prepared papers on various aspects of the subject — an excellent experiment which is much needed in the hectic West.

The task before this group was formidable enough, especially in a country where, as they say, Christians “do not seem to be vitally interested in contemporary political life”. Convinced that “the social revolution is the most dynamic factor in our contemporary national life”, the authors set out to analyse the two alternative means of channelling this revolution towards social justice, viz. communism and democracy.

After describing the appeal of communism to the peasant, industrial worker, student youth and intellectual, they affirm that “communism is not the same as the social revolution which is shaking to the roots our complacent world of traditional values... communists do not have the right explanation... nor do they give the right lead”. Much of the study is concerned with proving these indictments — and this is adequately done. Readers who are familiar with the analyses of writers like Niebuhr, Bennett, Miller and Tillich will find nothing particularly new in the more theoretical chapters, though what we have is both penetrating and stimulating. They will, however, be grateful for the “history of the communist party in India” and also for the summary of the Chinese communists’ attitude to the churches, which are both informative and up to date. Having rejected communism, the group indicates the pressing need “to redeem democracy by putting social, economic and cultural

substance in its forms". A true social democracy is defined as "a society where freedom, order and justice are dependent on and not destroyed by one another".

Is such a democracy possible in India today? The group quite emphatically says, "Yes", and refuses to be put off by the pessimists who speak of the inevitability of communism. A non-Asian is at first comforted by this assurance. But as he continues to read the very proper discussion on the communist challenge to the Church, the Christian conception of man, the Church's responsibility, and all the other affirmations which have now become the meat and drink of ecumenical thinking, he is left with an awkward question, "So what?"

This study is on "Communism *and* the Social Revolution in India". A great deal is said about communism, but no clear picture emerges about the peculiar nature and extent of the social revolution in India. True enough, one section is entitled "The Social Revolution", but what is given are two chapters on "communist betrayal of the social revolution" and "the alternative — a true social democracy". The book, one feels, would have gained considerably in perspective and realism, if, instead of making isolated comments, a resolute effort had been made to analyse the social revolution in a Hindu society, bringing out the forces within it which favour or militate against both communism and democracy.

We are told, for example, that "the goal of a casteless and classless society should be steadily before the Indian people", but how is this to be achieved in a country which is determined to be Hindu, despite having officially opted for a secular state? Earlier on our authors roundly state that "radical and immediate abolition of landlordism will help in this situation; it would mean a dispossession of all farm lands from those who now own them and a redistribution to people who actually till the soil and work on their farms". Yet, as Nehru himself has hinted, to do this would mean either not paying compensation to the dispossessed landlords, or, by paying all up, crippling the economy of the nation. This is in itself a challenge to the sort of democracy this book advocates, for the authors must surely know that the zamindars, capitalists and Brahmins, under cover of the democratic framework of the State, are all fighting a successful battle in preventing the sorts of reforms which are pressingly demanded in India today. Further, in spite of India's constant talk of neutrality, etc., over 50 % of the government's budget has gone into the armed forces — chiefly locked up, until lately, in an unfortunate harangue with Pakistan over Kashmir. At dead centre of all these workings of man in India are the cor-

roding effects of Hindu caste and custom. There is no associated enthusiasm of all, and custom makes difficult the quick redistribution of the land, the considerable increase in productivity, and population control. (Recent statistics show that the population increases by 5 million yearly ; that it is now 15 % higher than in 1941 and that by 1970 it will be 460 million.)

These cultural and religious aspects of the social revolution in India have not received adequate treatment by this enterprising group. If they had done so, they would not have written so complacently about democracy. For instance,

Democracy is suspicious of power. And [democracy has the instrument of making radical social changes non-violently and without loss of continuity. Gandhism has added its non-violent technique of *satyagraha* to Indian democracy.

Certainly the creation recently of the linguistic Andhra State by the technique of *satyagraha* has shown how dangerous an instrument it is to democracy. Indeed, many observers are wondering whether the technique may not be used to overthrow the democratic regime. The fact remains that democracy is fighting against time in India. Any reliance on a sort of see-saw operation of checks and balances where the basic premises of democracy are not accepted either by Brahmins or by communists is bound to spell disaster. The problem is a considerable one, not only for India, but for all countries emerging from technical backwardness and seeking to take their place in the world of nations without becoming a prey to communist revolution. A redefinition of democracy is undoubtedly needed ; but the one given here, while ideal, seems to the reviewer (who admittedly has never visited India) to be quite unrealistic for the present dangerous situation in India.

The book appears to be addressed to both communists and Christians. Much is said not only of communist theory, but of its practice in India. The writers, having learned the virtue of self-criticism, both as Christians and as students of communism, have emphasized the weaknesses of Christian witness in India. They outline what the Christian ought to think and say ; but even this exhortation loses much of its sting because the real dilemma of the situation is somehow not brought out. What one finds completely missing here is any indication or appraisal of what the churches are actually doing to help create the climate in which democracy can grow and flourish. Is it the inadequacy of this creative effort which intimidates our authors, or have they been caught in the intellectual's disdain of small things ? Are the churches' activities in India relevant at the present time ? If not, what concretely is to be done in a country,



some of whose leaders constantly threaten the Christian Church with absorption or... ?

*Communism and the Social Revolution in India* can be regarded as a vigorous preliminary statement, all the more useful for forcing us to ask urgently the right questions in the right order. As such it is of immense value for all who are concerned about Christian witness in this revolutionary world of ours. But the dialogue must continue.

PHILIP POTTER.

BASIC ECONOMIC PROBLEMS : A CHRISTIAN APPROACH, by John F. Sleeman. S.C.M. Press, London. 192 pp. 10s 6d.

"An economist who is nothing but an economist is a pretty poor fish." Because this is so obviously true in general, and so obviously untrue of Mr. Sleeman, who is Lecturer in Social Economics in the University of Glasgow, he has written this book and hopefully addressed it to his fellow academic economists, in "an attempt to break down the barriers which so often tend to cut off our professional thinking from our responsibilities as citizens". In this hope, Mr. Sleeman is justified, at least as far as this academic economist is concerned.

But the professionals in the game are only a part of the audience at whom the author has set his sights. Another part is made up of those who seem to believe that "if you teach a parrot to say 'supply and demand', you have an economist." Those with the slick answers, the pat solutions, the simple panaceas, those to whom "the inevitable logic of events" is an open book — to such as these, this outline of some of the incredible complexities of any given economic problem, and even more, of a solution to it, is directed. Another part of the audience is made up of those who are in fact so appalled by this very complexity that they give up trying to understand how the economy works, and how it might be made to work better. Yet another group are those who think that to understand or improve is none of their responsibility. It is mainly to these last two groups that the book is in fact explicitly directed. The author expresses in the preface his hope "that this book will be some help to those who want to arrive at a fuller understanding of the nature of the economic order. Such a fuller understanding is essential if our economic actions are to be responsible, and the need for responsible action cannot be evaded... We are bound up with the economic order whether we like it or not... We affect the working of the

system by the way we do our work and spend our incomes, and we are affected in turn by what others do."

There are three words in the title of the book which tell us most of what we want to know about its scope. *Approach* — the book is concerned with grappling with problems, and, to an equal extent, with a number of proposed solutions. Mr. Sleeman neither claims nor tries to solve all the problems. This is no criticism. Until everyone — especially economists — thinks a great deal more about economic problems, simple solutions are out of the question. *Christian* — the author is a Christian himself, which is perhaps even more unusual among economists than among other groups of technicians, and he is very much concerned with helping his fellow believers to understand, and so to help in changing the world in which they live, move and have their being. Is it certain that Christians who have neither the training, the opportunity, the desire, nor, one might say, the need to be trained economic theoreticians, should in fact bestir themselves to attain this understanding? Mr. Sleeman's answer is an unswerving — and unanswerable — "yes". He will rightly have no dealings with those who hold that the economic system is just a machine, and like any other machine, the only concern of a Christian, or of anyone else, should be to make its working as technically efficient as possible. If the costs of employing children underground in coal-mines are less than those of adult men, then employ the children. If total output can be raised by increasing the working week from 48 hours to 70, then do it, and never mind about leisure, pleasure, art and all that nonsense. To the author, the economic sphere of life is not the undisputed kingdom of the technocrat, the efficiency expert. Man may not be only what he eats, but he is to a very large extent. Work, and travelling to it, occupies at least half of most persons' waking hours. To regard the hours spent in factory, office or shop solely as time spent in producing more and more goods and services is to seal off a large part of life from Christian concern. And the theme of this book "is that Christianity is in fact concerned with the whole of life, including the economic order as an essential part of it... Christianity has a gospel for the economic order, if only we can come to understand it." The Son of God was, after all, an ordinary worker, a carpenter, as well as, and before He was a teacher. Moreover, in trying to discover how an economic system ought to work, Christians are, or should be, in a uniquely favourable position. For their faith is limited to no single time or place. More than the holders of any political or social gospel, they are, or should be, able to stand outside their period and to judge what they see in the light of what they

know. The author's concern is therefore to provide his readers with some knowledge of what economists have to say on how the system does work, and in what other ways it might be made to work. Only with that knowledge can they, as Christians and citizens, bring their faith to bear on the facts.

And finally *basic*. Mr. Sleeman is not concerned to tell us that in business we ought to pay our debts, stand by our contracts and keep our promises. These personal obligations he and all his readers would take for granted. Rather does he examine overall global problems. The structure of his book is indicated by the amount of space he devotes to the main themes of his chapters: 4 pp. to the philosophic aspect of Economics; 4 pp. to the development of a Christian economic philosophy; 12 pp. to a description of the purposes of an economic order, in the light of such a philosophy; 10 pp. to the criteria of such an (ideal) order, by which we can judge actual (and therefore imperfect) orders; 41 pp. to an account of the free enterprise economy; 20 pp. to the part played by planning in the economic system; 40 pp. to the implications of planning for economic efficiency and political freedom; 44 pp. to the responsibility of the Christian for understanding the economic system; and 4 pp. to his conclusions.

These are the things Mr. Sleeman discusses. How well does he do it? First let it be said that I am no bishop. I must, and since this is *The Student World*, can, safely leave it to readers to judge what he has to say about Christianity. May I however mention in passing, that another review I have seen, by a cleric, commended this side of the book. What then of Mr. Sleeman's economics? My blanket judgment is that this a very good book indeed. Into 190 pages, the author has crammed an unbelievable amount of good things — and they remain 190 very readable pages at that. At the price, every member of the S.C.M. can afford to buy it, and no member can afford not to read it.

After that, any criticisms may seem petty — certainly they are minor. Nevertheless they do exist. There is no index. Few books, even of only 190 pages, can fail to be improved by one. Perhaps as a compensation, there is, however, what should be a very useful bibliography of some 31 books for some further reading, though with the surprising omission of Hayek's *The Road to Serfdom*. And there are no less than a dozen misprints, which is far too many, and mars an otherwise attractive set-up.

So much for the medium. What of the content? First there are very few, which means too few, statistics. I found only five, and of these, only three really advance the argument. Consequently

one has the uncomfortable feeling that the real world is extremely remote. The author would perhaps counter by saying that he wants to apply his argument to any and every economy. But would he not have served himself better by applying it to at least one, and, since most readers of his book will probably be English, to the English one? Economists can no doubt fill out the discussion from their own experience, but what of the others, the majority perhaps, for whom the author was writing? And more important still is the fact that one has no idea, from the text alone, of what some of the remedies proposed would amount to in real terms. Just how unequal is the distribution of wealth and income in, say, post-war England? Is it getting better or worse? And how unequal would a distribution acceptable to Mr. Sleeman be? Just how widespread was unemployment in the pre-war years? How much did it fluctuate, i. e. how unstable was it, over time? How much unemployment would even a "tolerably" stable system be forced to allow in the interests of flexibility? And so on. Without some figures, one is left very much up in the clouds. But Mr. Sleeman should be, and wants to be, very much down-to-earth.

As far as particular points are concerned, one could of course find a number with which one could argue. If that were not so, how dull the book would be! But to choose a few. On pp. 35-40, Mr. Sleeman lists a number of criteria by which we might judge any system. One of these is a high rate of stable and flexible progress. Of this point not enough was made, I feel. Before the first world war, reformers were condemned to a history of "might-have-beens", and a future of "how-much-better-if-only", which to the man in the street is neither exciting nor convincing. Since then, however, we have before our eyes another type of economy, that of Soviet Russia, actually working. True, we know little about it, and what we do know we may wish to discount. But there can be little doubt that in fact the Russian economy is advancing at a significantly faster rate than that of any of the liberal economies of the western democracies. Take any figures you like — steel output, electricity generated — allow something for exaggeration, allow a great deal for the millions who starved to death in the great famine, allow something also for a police state, and a system of organized terror. And still, to the leaders of half the world, the prospect must remain attractive. The capitalist system has produced great results in the past. Now fabulous results are demanded of it. Can it do it?

Later on in the book, Mr. Sleeman points out that so far only totalitarian governments have planned their economic life fully. Because we are unwilling to accept the political implications of this,



we reject the economic too. Agreed. But one might also point out that planning, at least in Britain, is connected in the public mind with an inordinate, and unacceptable, amount of direct control. This connection may well be fortuitous, and I believe it is, as the result of the distortions of war, and not inherent in the nature of planning, even of the total planning that Mr. Sleeman criticizes severely. And again, on p. 127, he writes, "There are dangers in pushing this policy (of planning investment) too far. The planners' estimate of the prospective benefits of the schemes may be unsound, especially if the circumstances change in ways which they had not foreseen, and if this occurs on any scale, there may be considerable waste of resources." Very true — but equally true of investment in a private enterprise economy. And no more likely, but rather the opposite, in so far as so many more of the "changing circumstances" will now also be plannable.

Finally three technical points. On p. 47 there seems to be a slip. "If demand is increased relative to supply... price tends to rise, and this discourages an increase in supply." "Encourages", surely. And on p. 50, "The level of saving under free enterprise is determined by the expectations of income-receivers." As a bald statement, this is untrue. If one wants a single determinant, it is surely a past fact — the level of income received (and its distribution between persons, and its previous highest peak) — rather than any future expectation, which is vital. Expectations may cancel out, but money in the pocket is a fact. Thus the level of saving is much more "determined" than appears at first sight from this section.

And thirdly, one would have liked some more emphasis on our responsibility for those who live in the under-developed and desperately poor areas of the world. In the thirties, the great rallying cry was the immorality of "poverty in the midst of plenty". Can we now be very sure of the morality of "plenty in the midst of poverty"? Is not the corollary of a welfare-state a "welfare world" in which there is a levelling down of the incomes of those who are lucky enough to live in the richer countries, i. e. of *our* incomes, and a levelling up for those who live in the East and Africa? We have grown used to this happening as between Mayfair and the mining areas, but can we avoid it in the outside world too?

But all these criticisms could be considered for a second edition. It certainly deserves to have one — it's a very good book.

ROGER G. OPIE.

CAMPUS GODS ON TRIAL, by Chad Walsh. Macmillan Company, 1953. pp. 131. \$2.50.

The question which this book poses for the Church in its mission to students is that of its content: the question of the apologetic undertaking. What are we to say to this special concern of theological liberalism? This question is really a question of faith. Is it possible for faith to remain faith when it sets out to show that Christianity is one among other choices that a student may make, be it a better or truer choice? When faith presents itself as one possibility alongside of other possibilities, has it not already ceased to be faith in the living God in Christ? Is not the only valid "apologetics" that of John 1: 46, in which faith points not to itself (as a possibility) but simply to its object (who is Lord, and therefore to whom there is no alternative), saying, "Come and see"? There is also the practical question: are students actually impressed by a form of Christianity that meets them half-way, begging for their approval, rather than as a witness of the sovereign grace of the God who stands over against all human choices and every upward-seeking of man? In my limited experience with the mission to students it has not appeared that they were convinced by this technique. Such an adjustment of faith to the world only bores the world. The children of darkness are often wiser than the children of light!

Professor Walsh wishes to provide the student reader with that which is lacking on the average American campus: an analysis of the various pseudo-religions of our time, critically compared with the Christian alternative. The contents of his book follow this intention. It opens with a sketch of the theological illiteracy of the average student upon arrival at college, and of the profusion of answers there presented to him. Then follow short summaries of various campus "gods" (progress, humanism, communism, relativism, psychology, and scientism), with hasty refutations from the Christian point of view. The criterion by which these "gods" are measured and found wanting is the question whether they "bring alive the hidden 'I', provide an answer to the 'ought'" (p. 53). A special chapter is devoted to scientism, in which the conflict between science and miracle is resolved. After several chapters answering various criticisms levelled at Christians and their religion, the Christian alternative is presented. The origins of the faith are given, with a good, simple summary of the results of biblical criticism, and the book concludes with a presentation of the Christian faith.



It will be revealing to British and European students to notice the level on which Professor Walsh feels obliged to do battle. The superficiality with which the "gods" are set up and knocked down, as well as of the presentation of the Christian faith, is probably necessitated by the intellectual capacity of the student audience he has in mind. With simplicity of style and explanation, of course, we can have no quarrel. It is what is so simply said that is open to question. What the author has to say is revealed by his criterion of personal fulfilment and moralism (the "I" and the "ought"). Is it really from such a purely anthropologically based criterion that we see the difference between faith and unbelief? Is the author's peculiar form of moralism the distinctively Christian answer to scientism? This anthropological approach of Professor Walsh is also seen in the happy marriage he creates between miracle and science, which is reminiscent of the title of Toland's *Christianity Not Mysteriorious*, and even more clearly in his unashamed acceptance of the undamaged *liberum arbitrium*: "Our freedom to go to heaven is not real unless we are also free to go to hell" (p. 85, Contrast Luke 10: 21, John 9: 39, 15: 16. As if the choice of hell were an act of freedom! But is not this unbiblical conclusion the inevitable conclusion of starting out with an unbiblical foundation?). It was, with all this, no surprise to find, in the presentation of the Christian "alternative", that the author has a most uncertain understanding of the divinity of Christ: "somehow 'one' with God" (p. 126) is his strongest statement.

We began by saying that such an apologetic undertaking as this was the concern of theological liberalism. We have here, of course, a form of liberalism that knows how, "somehow", to call Christ God and speak favourably of the doctrine of the Trinity. Yet because the author understands Christianity as a "religion", one among others, and clearly one that is found by man (pp. 33, 35, 37, 39; contrast John 15: 16!), and which comes in as the answer to the previously established questions of individual fulfilment and morality, his more orthodox affirmations totter (what else could they do?) on their anthropological foundations. But even if my fellow Episcopalian understood the Christian faith in terms of the biblical witness, rather than in terms that sound more like Schleiermacher, the question of the apologetic undertaking would remain. The value of this book is that it points up the problem of the legitimacy and value of this undertaking as a means of student evangelism.

PAUL VAN BUREN.



GOD HIDDEN AND REVEALED, by John Dillenberger. Foreword by Paul Tillich. Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, 1953. xxiv, 193 pp. \$2.50.

It is sometimes said that the hidden God of Christian belief sheds His mystery and reveals Himself in the Incarnation. Actually this very point of revelation is the most mysterious of all God's acts. That the Creator and Lord should be revealed in a man suffering death on a cross is inevitably a stumbling block. This revelation, far from doing away with the divine mystery, means that "God is most hidden at the moment of fullest disclosure" (p. xiv). The response to God's revelation must be faith, not an understanding which sees through the mystery.

This declaration forms the central contention of John Dillenberger's able and provocative book. The Columbia University scholar finds that this conception, though known frequently in Christian thought, was expressed most powerfully by Martin Luther. The rediscovery of the insight into "the correlation of revelation and hiddenness", after some centuries of neglect is, according to Dr. Dillenberger, the key to the theological revolution of recent years.

In developing its thesis this book investigates the treatment of Luther in the modern theological tradition. Showing a remarkable knowledge of the interpreters of Luther, especially in Germany, Dillenberger maintains that the Ritschlian tradition generally lost the significance of Luther's idea of the "hidden God". He finds that Rudolf Otto had a profounder understanding of Luther than his generation, but never carried his discoveries fully into the context of Christian theology.

With Brunner and Barth the picture changes. Brunner appreciates the hiddenness of God in revelation (p. 114), but remains ambiguous on the relation between the revelation in the cross and general revelation (p. 113). Barth, "the most consistent Christological thinker in the history of theology" (p. 117) boldly and clearly makes the point.

But Dillenberger wishes that Barth, having established theology securely on the basis of the revelation in Christ, would then move on to more positive relations with culture, philosophy, and the history of religions (p. 142). Theology, then, needs not to seek some middle ground between liberalism and the neo-orthodoxy of Barth and Brunner, but to move beyond this neo-orthodoxy (pp. 143, 153).

This book is packed with thorough scholarship and deep thought. It is not easy. One might wish for more literary grace to make it more pleasant reading. But those who study it will find themselves wrestling with major issues.

ROGER L. SHINN.